DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 025 992 HE 000 205

By-Susman, Warren I.

The Reconstruction of an American College, Some Proposals for Rutgers College.

Rutgers, The State Univ., New Brunswick, N.J. Rutgers Coll.

Pub Date Oct 68

Note-121p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$6.15

Descriptors-*College Environment, College Faculty, *College Role, *Curriculum Development, *Educational Programs, *Higher Education, Instructional Improvement, Instructional Innovation, Integrated Activities, Student Participation

An intensive study of Rutgers College was made during the spring semester of the 1967-1968 school year for the purpose of evaluating the College's instructional program. The report examines many institutional functions within the context of current higher education concerns and their particular relationship to the perceived role of Rutgers College. Recommendations are made to revitalize, or to completely retain, some programs, policies or practices, depending on the extent of their contributions to the College's overall purpose. If they defeat general educational aims, it is proposed that they be discarded and efforts made to provide relevant, innovative educational experiences. Emphasis is placed on the development of a college self-identity, and the need to replace an outdated, rigidly administered instructional program with a "living" curriculum, based on flexible principles, that would adapt to ever-changing institutional and social needs. Other topics included in the report deal with student self-image, faculty and student participation in decision-making processes, college environment, individual fulfillment, and the improvement of teaching. (WM)

ED025992

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE RECONSTRUCTION OF AN AMERICAN COLLEGE

Some Proposals for Rutgers College

Warren I. Susman

HE000205

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY *The State University of New Jersey*
Rutgers College

THE RECONSTRUCTION OF AN AMERICAN COLLEGE

Some Proposals for Rutgers College

Warren I. Susman

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY *The State University of New Jersey*
Rutgers College
Ocotber 1968

Additional Copies are
available at $1.00 from:

Office of the Dean, Rutgers College
Milledoler Hall
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08903

Printed in the United States of America
S & S Printing
Somerset, New Jersey

FOREWORD

The cooperation of the Provost of the University, Dr. Richard Schlatter, and the Chairman of the College Department of History, Dr. Richard McCormick, made it possible for me to invite History Professor Warren Susman to spend the spring semester of 1967-68 studying the educational program of Rutgers College.

Professor Susman's resulting report, "The Reconstruction of an American College," is a highly personal document. It will antagonize many persons. I know of no one who would subscribe to all of its recommendations. Some will be offended by its style alone. For these reasons and, far more importantly, because of what it says, it is a most valuable statement. It delves deeply into many central concerns of contemporary higher education particularly as they relate to this College. Everyone who reflects upon this report will have profited from a significant educational experience.

But that is not the reason why this report was prepared. The purpose of the study was to involve faculty and students of the College in an intensive inquiry into our instructional program. That we find to be good in the College we should retain. Other habits should be discarded. Innovations that contribute to our goals should be adopted.

I hope Professor Susman's report will stimulate an intensive inquiry -- a college conversation about the role of Rutgers College in the scheme of things. I am less interested in the procedures upon which we come to agree than in the debate that leads us to agreement. The process is more important than the product.

Arnold B. Grobman
Dean
Rutgers College

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY *The State University of New Jersey*

RUTGERS COLLEGE

Dean Arnold B. Grobman
Rutgers College
Milledoler Hall
New Brunswick, New Jersey

Dear Dean Grobman:

I have always wanted to write an epistolary preface and here is my opportunity.

Last Spring I was invited to address a convocation and to report to the assembled students something of what I was now thinking about the nature of the curriculum after almost a semester of investigation. There were special auspices that day: the heavens thundered and threatened a downpour at any moment; students sat ill at ease, somehow too well dressed for students and too many obviously constituting a captive audience; there were mumblings of strange conflicts because of sharp disputes that had broken out earlier in Student Council and the Student Body President offered a strong and most effective speech not calculated to win friends; and even Willy the Silent, strange and ambiguous figure he has always appeared to me, seemed finally ready to speak. It was an eerie occasion. Besides, it was the First of May!

Now such an event under such auspices seemed to demand of me a certain kind of speech. I thought immediately of chains and of casting them off. The theme of revolution had taken on special significance that Spring on college campuses around the world. For just a moment (there was a flash of lightning) I found myself on the verge of calling for the students to arise and take Old Queens.

But there are moments when the most revolutionary thing seems to be construction rather than destruction, when the most radical approach seems to be rebuilding amid the rubble. It was then that I knew that this report could not be the careful, scientific analysis with the neat prescriptions for a series of minor reforms I had planned to write. At that moment I knew that I would call this report The Reconstruction of an American College, a personal report to the college on the enormous possibilities for achievement here.

So the report that follows is not quite the document that you hoped for nor that I had expected to write when I undertook to make some recommendations for curricular revision. For one thing, I found myself devising not simply a series of very specific recommendations, but a full program of reform in which the individual parts could be treated separately but were related to one another by an overall view of the educational process. That process itself came more and more to fascinate me; in the course of my work, I found myself developing a position very different from the one I held at the outset.

I have made little effort to document what follows: there are few statistics and fewer learned quotations. The report is intensely personal; it represents one man's vision, a personal vision although it has borrowed heavily from many sources and is based on considerable systematic study. When you were able to provide funds for the History Department to release me from undergraduate teaching obligations for the Spring Semester, I undertook to read extensively in the available literature of higher education -- and it is vast. It will be obvious to anyone who examines this report how much it owes to the major collection of studies edited by Nevitt Sanford _The American College_ and the thoughtful collection of essays edited by R. D. Archambault _Philosophical Analysis and Education_. My total bibliography, were I to provide one, would include over 750 titles. I examined seriously every major college and university report on curriculum from the crucial Muscatine Report _Education at Berkeley_ to the probing Swarthmore _Critique of a College_ -- North and South, East and West, and yes, even abroad, for I was much influenced in my thinking by the reports on developments in England, especially at Sussex.

I visited four college campuses for extended stays and corresponded with officials and teachers at a dozen more. I held most fruitful discussions with over 1,000 undergraduates on this campus and came to admire them more than ever; I talked informally with more than 150 of my colleagues on the faculty and discovered some of them were extraordinarily bright about such matters. I was able to receive some help from close to 50 more recent graduates (although perhaps unfortunately most often from those who had gone on to graduate or professional schools). The enthusiasm and interest of everyone was encouraging and the cooperation outstanding.

I am grateful to Miss Anna Benjamin who made me welcome at the lively meetings of the Douglass Council during its curricular discussions and to Dick Forman who allowed me to participate in the excellent meetings of his active Educational Methods and Policy Committee last year. Reg Bishop knows more about how the college operates than anyone else around here; without his outstanding cooperation (and that of everyone in the Office of the Dean of the College) there simply could be no report. Howard Crosby was more than generous with his time and interest and everyone on his staff made a genuine contribution to my work. Bill Kolodinsky helped make the fact and figures available from the remarkable admissions operation meaningful to me. One of the strengths of our college is obviously the high quality of its administrative personnel.

There are special debts I owe to my colleagues Donald Weinstein and Herbert Rowen; because they are good friends they were severe critics and the latter's extraordinary work on the manuscript was far above the call even of friendship. Naturally, I am especially grateful to all my departmental colleagues who were kind enough to agree to releasing me from teaching obligations for the semester. I belong to a great department; it is one that sets many of the ideals I try in this report to extend to the college as a whole, for it has been a constant source of intellectual excitement and renewal to talk continually with my own very able fellow historians about all matters and especially about issues of educational policy. It is a department that knows precisely what the great conversation is.

And there are, of course, special thanks for you, Dean Grobman, who provided me with this challenge. I was frankly surprised when you asked me to undertake this assignment; I fear that you will be disappointed with the results. I should have liked to have redeemed your confidence in me. I apologize for the report's lack of "science;" for its often too intensely personal quality of the rhetoric. But what I do provide ought at least to start some thought and some debate and I know how anxious you are for that to happen in the college.

In this debate I ask no favor. I have, because of my tone and method, opened the report to precisely the most rigorous kinds of criticism. I ask only two things: may no one tell me that the proposals contain too much that is not practical. Since the day I arrived on this campus some nine years ago every last suggestion I have ever made has been labelled "not practical" (generally before there could be any thought about the substance of the matter); yet time after time I have seen these or similar proposals put into effective operation on other campuses across the country. No one knows what practical is until the attempt is made to put it into practice. I have sufficient faith that our administrators are able enough to render the "impractical" practical. Second,let no one tell me that most of these plans are based on a much too optimistic view of both students and faculty. I, for one am convinced that people can become what we hope of them.

With this final request, I respectfully submit this series of recommendations for the reconstruction of Rutgers College with the earnest wish that it will some day truly know the greatness of which the College is capable.

Sincerely yours,

Warren I. Susman

Warren I. Susman
Professor
Department of History

Contents Page

The Renewal of the College 1

The Crisis in the College 6

Recommendation: The Establishment of the Four Schools 12

Recommendation: The Time Factor 22

Recommendation: The Exploratory Semesters 29

Recommendation: General Education and Distribution Requirements 38

Recommendation: Physical Education 48

Recommendation: The Major Program 49

Recommendation: New Programs in the College 58

Recommendation: A Council for Educational Development 68

Recommendation: The Open College 73

Recommendation: The Apprenticeship Program 80

Recommendation: Skills and Testing Center 82

Recommendation: The Improvement of Teaching 86

Recommendation: The Schedule 92

Recommendation: Library and Bookstore 94

Recommendation: Commitment to Community Service 96

Recommendation: The Rutgers College Project 99

Recommendation: The Black Student 105

Recommendation: Honors 108

Recommendation: Summer Session 109

Conclusion 110

THE RENEWAL OF THE COLLEGE

This report is dedicated to the ideal of constant reappraisal and renewal. Any college is a living thing that, as it grows older, ought to discover the secret of self-renewal. The curriculum for such a college must not be a set of rules and regulations but a series of principles productive of institutions and programs that grow and adapt to changing needs: a living curriculum. The University has taken two steps which make necessary a reexamination of our foundations, the federated college plan and the "new" college we have legally become with the rebirth of Rutgers College. But the changing situation in the world around us as well as our own internal changes ought to force us to reassess what we are doing and how we are doing it. We are certainly not the same college we were a quarter of a century ago when our current curriculum was fundamentally imposed.

Our increase in size itself is noteworthy. In 1958 the College awarded 358 Bachelor of Arts degrees; in 1968, 1,082. But even more significant is the change in quality of the student body. By 1960 the College felt it could drop remedial work in mathematics and English (in 1958 17% of the Freshman class required remedial work in English, for example). Between 1959 and 1962 Rutgers became one of the most selective of public institutions; its admissions record rated it among the first 12 publicly controlled colleges or universities behind only such institutions as Brooklyn College, CCNY, The University of California, and the University of Michigan. And we have become even more selective since then. In 1959 the median rank in class for entering Freshmen was 23/100; the mean verbal SAT score was 513 and mean mathematics SAT 576. By 1968 the median rank in class had risen to 13/100; the mean VSAT to 558; the mean MSAT to 608.

If the quality of the entering class as a whole has improved noticeably, there are even more striking changes within the class. In the class of 1959 only 10% of the students ranked in the 600-800 range on the verbal SAT scores; in the class of 1969 27% were in this category. In 1959 66% of the class could be found in the range below 500; in 1969 only 22%. The mathematics scores are equally revealing. The rate of attrition has significantly decreased in spite of heightened academic standards in the College: it was necessary to drop almost 16% of the Freshman class of 1964 for academic reasons yet less than 7% of the class of 1970 suffered that fate. Almost 76% of the class of 1967 remained to graduate. There is additional evidence in the grade distribution within the college, in post-graduate awards, in the admission of graduates to professional and graduate schools. What has happened is simple and clear; we have a first-rate student body.

Moreover, the students admitted have far exceeded the College's requirements for admission. It is becoming unusual to find an entering student who does not come to us with four years of high school mathematics (although we require only three); last year's Freshman class presented an average of 3.5 years of foreign language preparation. A great many students come with 3 years in one language and 2 years in still another and more and more frequently we are getting students with 4 years preparation in a single language. While we have no specific requirement of years of scientific study it is increasingly rare to find incoming students without two years of high school science. *

While the student body remains largely homogeneous- a New Jersey middle class group (no more than 10% come from out of state and these largely from neighboring states and from similar backgrounds)- there are fewer commuters and more campus residents. While approximately 15% of our students are commuters (roughly some 270 in each entering class of 1770), well over half of our students live in the residence halls while 10% live in fraternities. The campus is more and more becoming the total center of living and learning.

Yet in spite of all these important changes in our student body there has been no major change in curriculum. There have been a very few new programs; there has been a wide shift in major areas of student interest, in some cases clearly related to a sifnificant improvement in the quality of various departments in the college and this has usually meant a more interesting and challenging upperclass program for many students. General college policy and program has been rationalized by a greater variety of rules and regulations and more clear-cut procedures. A well-ordered bureaucracy has grown in size and significance. But there has been no fundamental rethinking of aims and needs in terms of the new student group. This is more alarming because, as Erik Erikson says, "The youth of today is not the youth of twenty years ago." He states this as a simple fact, and indeed,

---

*The statistics cited tell us little about the qualitative changes that have occurred within the high schools of which the various advanced placement programs are but one example. It is obviously difficult to measure the full consequences of such improved and enriched teaching in many fields, but my colleagues in some of the sciences, for example, tell me that in these areas at least the results have been significant. Certainly our students come with greater sophistication and awareness than ever before.

as a new fact. No previous generation has been so self-aware, so concerned about its own identity. With its searching and striving, its strong sense of personal and moral urgency, its demand for involvement, its shifting patterns of interest, this is a new youth and not the same student body for whom the college designed its general education program and wrote its regulations.

Any discussion of "youth" or of the "student" is of course in a sense an abstract discussion with little live individual detail. We learned long ago that there were many different kinds of students, just as we learned over the centuries that there were many kinds of knowledge and even more uses to which such knowledge might be put. The liberal arts college is thus always many things to many people. There has always been at all such colleges a rather large group who come for four years of fun and games, free of the responsibilities of the adult world and yet at the same time largely free of familial restraints. They generally care but little about the nature of the curriculum except when they feel its demands interfere with their pleasure, and often they are even less concerned with the larger moral and political interests of a wider world than the campus. Evidence does suggest, however, that even such students are changed in important ways by their four-year stay, almost in spite of themselves. Few are willing to argue for their elimination from the college community so long as they maintain a certain academic standard and many see them making a contribution to the life of the campus.

There are those whose primary interest is professional: they seek training that will enable them to enter law and medical school or graduate school in the field of their special interest. They come willing to do hard work and to practice at least some of the self-denial rigorous programs of training often demand. Many are attracted to Rutgers because of its success in placing such students in the better professional and graduate schools. Their numbers, in fact, absolutely and relatively, are increasing. In 1959 roughly 45% aimed for such post-graduate work; by the class of 1969 that figure had climbed to 60%. This group constitutes our major clientele and the group that the college can now make substantial claims to serve well in providing necessary training. Almost 1/3 of our student body seeks admission to a professional school upon graduation; almost 1/4 to graduate schools. For both groups the rate of admission is very high. In the case of history, if I may be allowed to speak of the experience of my own department, there are few years when our senior majors are not sought out by outstanding graduate schools; many of our students find themselves deciding between several handsome fellowship offers. The experience in history is certainly not unique in the College.

Other students come less with a desire to beome professional than to learn how they might best be able to play a significant role in American life in business, industry, and government. They seek the understanding and the necessary skills to help maintain and improve the "system." Thus they learn how to assume a vital social role and in doing so achieve a degree of personal success and status.

There is at least one other large category of student: the young men who come for what amounts to four years of searching in a conscious effort to define themselves and their relationship to the world. Not immediately oriented toward a profession or even a career, they strive for a definition of the meaning of their experience, a purpose for freedeom that goes beyond the pleasures of four years away from home.

If there are clearly diverse elements among the student body, each with its own legitimate demands to make of the college, there are equally great differences among the faculty. With the great increase in numbers and ability of faculty in the last decade especially has come an even more dramatically sharpened sense of the variety of our interests, our views as to our nature and function in the college.

There are some members of the faculty who consider their primary function passing on to others the great traditions of humane learning; some consider it their function to help make their students, "wise," others to make them "informed." But all these consider their fundamental task as lying not so much in the area of training as in the realm of enrichment of life through learning. Others care less for learning in itself but rather seek to use the classroom to help students solve their problems, arguing that teaching is a kind of psychotheraphy. A variant of this position holds that teachers should "stimulate" their students to "think," "to find themselves," or to "commit themselves" to social or political service. There are members of the faculty who believe their primary responsibility is training young men to take an active and intelligent role in managing the world. More and more members of the faculty, especially since the graduate program of the University has expanded, see their role largely in terms of creating tomorrow's professionals. College programs for undergraduates (with "seminars," independent study, senior theses) frequently reflect a desire to make college students into fledgling graduate students and an undergraduate education as simply preparation for graduate work. Finally, there are those members of the faculty who would insist that their main function is to provide undergraduates with models of excellence as men of learning, creative researchers and writers. There exist, therefore, different kinds of teachers as well as students in Rutgers College. Any college should pride itself on this variety and must make it educationally useful.

This problem of variety in the college is related to the larger question of the nature of knowledge itself, its kinds and its uses. The ancient Greek thinkers proposed that one kind of knowledge might make men good while at the same time they saw that a very different kind of knowledge might make men good citizens. As if this paradox were not troublesome enough, thinkers by the Seventeenth Century were ready to argue that significant knowledge is power over the world around us. By the Nineteenth Century still another kind of knowledge was extolled: knowledge that enabled man to achieve mastery over himself. Colleges and universities have, at their best, insisted that all such functions, all such kinds of knowledge and inquiry, are legitimate. The variety of roles, the variety of functions have enriched our college experiences. We have refused to settle on one definition, one function, one kind of product.

Somewhere behind it all has been the view that we must all respect everyone's right to learn and to teach individually, that differences are of fundamental value in this grand conversation we call education. No particular method of instruction is ruled out of order, no particular vision of knowledge or its function in the world insisted upon, no one specific model of student or teacher demanded. Variety is cherished; what is common in the college is not a set of courses, a sequence of work, a group of requirements, but the conversation and its quality, the interplay and its effectiveness. We demand no particular finished product; we define no final end. What we stress rather in this search for renewal is the importance of the process itself.

THE CRISIS IN THE COLLEGE

Every report on higher education has to talk about "the crisis." This report proposes to deal with our crisis: "the crisis" as seen in our own back yard. The recommendations that follow are suggested as solutions of central problems in our local context, even when they run parallel to developments on other campuses. Even when the recommendations themselves resemble policies adopted elsewhere they have in all cases had to be modified to meet our special needs.

First, there is the question of college identification and student self-image. One of the advantages of our new definition as Rutgers College within the new federated college plan is that we must face up to what we, as Rutgers College, are. That challenge is all the greater because many of our students (and some members of the faculty too) regard Rutgers College, in spite of all evidence to the contrary, as second rate. They come with little sense of identification with the college, little desire to be a part of it, little belief that they have a chance here to share in greatness. In too many instances the young men admitted here would have rather attended another school. There is no tradition in New Jersey such as is found in the middle west, for example, where students grow up with a single educational dream, to go to the State University. Here the dream is to leave the state, at least for higher education, and selection for admissions at Rutgers does not bring with it, for many, a sense of pride and achievement.

In large part these attitudes are sustained because the college itself does little to create any full sense of what Rutgers College really is. There is no college really; there is instead a collection of departments each going its own way. The first two years of so-called general education do not create a vision of an educational process but remain simply a series of unrelated, large, introductory, required courses. Freshmen, especially, find themselves taking prescribed programs. Students participate little in making any important educational choices and therefore get little genuine sense of what he or the college is about. Nor does the faculty. Only once in the past several decades has there been any wide-scale college discussion of the nature and purpose of education on this campus and at the end almost all of the Self-Study Committee's recommendations were rejected. The faculty does little to help define Rutgers College as anything distinct and special. The college lacks any sense of its own style. It has no programs that distinguish it from hundreds of similar institutions. It has first-rate scholars, outstanding departments, and excellent courses but nothing to define Rutgers College as a whole as first-rate, outstanding, or excellent. Even courses currently considered essential for general education are left completely in the hands of individual departments (sometimes even individual members of departments); no general college discussion takes place about them or their educational function. We have become divided into a series of departments.

It is a central belief on which much of this report is based that departments should remain strong and vigorous and become even more useful to our educational program. I would resist any effort to undercut their strength, which is after all one of our great assets. But I hold we need to become more than a series of departments, that students and faculty alike must participate in an effort to define our college, to give it a style of its own, to make a Rutgers College education a different and special experience.

It is precisely this failure to have a view of the meaning of the college itself that lies behind many of the other significant difficulties we face in trying to maintain a living curriculum. First, the faculty have increasingly failed to involve themselves in the life of the college; faculty meetings until recently have been generally routine and ill-attended and the faculty, concerned with scholarly excellence and the improvement of graduate and pre-graduate education, has been willing to allow administrative officials to undertake more and more of the general work of the college.

Two things must be said here bluntly and definitely: The faculty has been willing to establish a set of requirements and sometimes to debate modifications of them, but rarely has it been willing to raise over-all issues of educational philosophy. It has generally been willing to accept suggestions from the administration or from college committees on new courses and new procedures with little debate and little concern over fundamentals. But little by little the faculty has allowed rules and regulations to become rigid and fixed; formalism has replaced a living curriculum and a vital college. More and more students get the impression that the forms have become more important than the substance of the learning process itself. This rigidity must be eliminated; the system must be made more flexible, the opportunities for individual learning more respected. We cannot blame the growing rigidity on the administration. The faculty has surrendered its prerogatives; it has not kept up its end of the conversation about education.

Secondly, if this is true in the area considered strictly "academic," it is even more the case in the wide area of total college environment. We now know that effective liberal education depends not only on classroom work and

and student-teacher relationships but also on the total campus environment. Yet it is generally true that the faculty has had only the most limited interest here; it has allowed dormitory policy, for example, to be determined in administrative realms; it has paid little attention to admissions policy which is crucial in determining the nature of the student body. Has the faculty even discussed the kind of student body it wants on campus? Is it satisfied with current policies and standards? Does it even know what they are? Matters for social and academic discipline have been exclusively the concern of administrators and college committees without any significant review by the full faculty. Yet frequently there are issues of policy involved that are of consequence for the total environment and ought to be reviewed from time to time. Do the faculty mean to allow such matters to go by default? Can we have a college where so many fundamental decisions on policy and program are delegated to deans, administrators, and committees, however able, and rarely studied by the college faculty? Rigidity and formalism are in part the consequence of the lack of faculty involvement with campus life and a willingness to let the system go bureaucratic.

These problems are part of the heritage Rutgers College carried with it when it was newly constituted. If this act provides us with an opportunity for developing a new sense of college identity, the plan has difficulties that may prove troublesome. Nothing is more obvious than the threat offered to functioning as a unified college community when some members of that group, faculty and students, are not subject to the over-all curricular control exercised over the rest of the college. The inclusion in Rutgers College of students and faculty from Engineering and from Agriculture and Environmental Science thus provides an additional problem in our search for identity. The federated college plan presents other confusions. Livingston College, for example, is also designated as a multi-purpose college. How will we be different, other than in being a men's college? What will be our unique contribution to the University? It is vital that we begin to answer these questions.

There is much talk about student apathy; much of what I have already suggested indicates some of the reasons for such apathy. For students to be actively engaged they must have a special stake. But rigidity and formalism make genuine interest and involvement difficult. We often say that a liberal education is designed to make our students free men, but our main tools thus far have been a series of requirements and regulations. We really believe that students can be forced to be free. The student submits himself to the process, makes what limited choices he is allowed to, and passes on. Why should he be anything but apathetic?

As in almost all other American institutions of higher learning, lack of faculty involvement, coupled with enormous growth, has led to a concern for bookkeeping rather than for educating. We certify that someone has been through the mill, that he has maintained a fairly consistent temperature throughout, but we can say little about the final product. We encourage students to compete but never quite explain what the competition is all about (what is the function of the Dean's List that appears in almost every American college?). What are they competing for? Students are not identified as men of Rutgers College who have done or made something that contributes to their own development or the life of the college or the wider society. We look for ways to turn possible individual achievement into statistical form: the numbers admitted to professional schools or graduate schools, the rank in class, etc. I do not object to student numbers as such, although students complain that this reveals increasing impersonality on campus. I object more strenuously than they do, however, about the ease with which they seem willing to accept identification by cumulative average. "What is your 'cume'?" they ask each other. "What is your 'cume'?" we ask them when they come for a special favor. Rarely do we ask them what they know and what they are and who they want to be; we all, students and faculty, settle for the easier statistical method of identification.

I do not mean to suggest that I believe we can or should eliminate all of this but I think we must face up more honestly than we have to the dangers of a bookkeeping approach, to the concern for product over process. The college asks too often, "How many credits do you have?" rather than "What have you learned?" We want to know how many hours a course takes rather than a statement of its value for our students. Our very language gives us away. In the United States a student "takes" a course or a program; in England a young man would go to the university to "do" mathematics or to "read" the classics. If we continue to insist that our students "take" a particular program, if we insist that he must total up a certain number of hours and credits "taken" at a certain grade level, and if we further allow a student to believe that he has in fact been educated if he does as he has been told, we have in fact insisted on apathy from start to finish.

Emerson, criticizing the educational system of his day, said, "We are sent to a feudal school to learn democracy." His words still apply. The Emersonian vision would have us know that the nature of the institution in which we teach and in which our students learn constitutes a vital part of the process of education itself. Thus our rules and regulations, our requirements, our attitudes toward grades, averages, credits, hours, our attitudes toward student life in all its aspects becomes a part of the educational pattern. If we believe in liberal education we must provide the kind of environment which best exemplifies what we mean by "liberal." No number of courses, no special kinds of courses alone will suffice. We must end the unhappy vision shared by both faculty and students that a few new courses or a few adjustments in sequences of courses or course requirements will somehow make it all different.

The crisis in the college is simply defined: we have preached education designed for a set of noble ends and failed to provide an environment which is itself a model of those ends in action. Our means have too often clashed sharply with our stated ends. The time has come to see whether we mean what we say. There are those who believe that liberal education or general education are doomed. Professor Richard McCormick in his history of the University points out that the growth of specialization, the increased orientation toward graduate study, the proliferation of courses, the narrowing areas of competency after 1956, "obviously imperiled" that "traditional ideal of the unity of the liberal arts college." Yet he found that that ideal was "still cherished." It is cherished still today on this campus but there is considerable pessimism about the possibility of its achievement. It is that challenge that this report accepts.

To face the real crisis of the liberal arts college means to increase faculty and student involvement in the total life of the college. Neither alone can succeed. The answer must be "college power." This report recommends a series of steps, all of which taken together would call for more participation than any members of the faculty or any members of the student body might be willing to undertake. Yet what I suggest is in a sense a minimum. The college must become a college once again rather than a collection of departments, no matter how excellent. With this goal we can preserve the ideal of the unity of a liberal arts college through a new and total view of what Rutgers College is, defining a new college style that is our own, providing a vision of a process and a set of institutions and programs that can contribute to the development of the liberal arts ideal. If we look beyond more courses and think about new ways to define our educational experience at Rutgers College, we may have not only renewed our college but renewed the ancient ideal of the liberal arts as well -- and done so without denying the fundamental value of specialization. For the issue has never been specialization versus generalization: it is rather how the two can relate.

Some of you know Marianne Moore's lovely little poem:

> I attended school and I liked the place --
> grass and little locust-leaf shadows like lace.
>
> Writing was discussed. They said,"We create
> values in the process of living, daren't await

their historical progress." Be abstract
and you will wish you'd been specific; it's a fact.

What was I studying? Values in use,
"judged on their own ground." Am I still abstruse?

Walking along, a student said offhand,
" 'Relevant' and 'plausible' were words I understand."

A pleasing statement, anonymous friend.
Certainly the means must not defeat the end.

I propose that a Rutgers College education attempt to 'create values in the process of living," that we concern ourselves with "values in use" and never allow the means to defeat the end.

And as for me, I promise that most of what follows will be more specific and less abstract!

RECOMMENDATION:
THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE FOUR SCHOOLS

My call for reconstructing our college does not mean many major structural changes. I repeat my conviction that any effort to weaken the role of strong and vital departments would simply weaken the whole of the college. There is, furthermore, nothing inherently contradictory in retaining academic specialization while at the same time working for the enrichment of the liberal functions of the college. Specialization can, in fact, aid general education by providing ways of seeing and dealing with experience that are not available to "generalists." Obviously, we want the very best specialization we can get and this can only be achieved by the fullest cooperation with our graduate school enterprise. In another section of this report, I defend the idea of the "major" as part of a college education, although I am aware that many students and some faculty call this idea itself into question. But at the same time that I defend the status quo in departmental structure, I do so with qualifications. To maintain their significant position in the college the departments must themselves become more responsible for more general education as well as their specialities and pre-professional training. They must be more responsible for their student majors, not only as fledgling members of their disciplines but as young men being educated in the college.

My proposal in this section of the report is at least initially directed toward the solution of problems students face during their first two years and most especially during their first year on campus. First, I am convinced that it is no longer possible to regard year designation as a significant way for students to identify themselves or for colleges to deal with them. While there are perhaps certain common experiences which do tend to unite freshmen or seniors as separate "classes," when the size of a class becomes as large as 1760 the value of those common experiences for uniting students or making that experience meaningful becomes reduced. For the college to deal with that size group as a whole means that the student's campus career begins in an atmosphere of massive impersonality.

Second, the faculty has defined curriculum too narrowly and has failed to see that the education of a student depends upon the whole environment in which learning takes place. We must address ourselves to the dormitory situation, for example, and its role in the process of education. We cannot continue to assume that functions like advising and orientation are to be done through agencies other than faculty during normal processes of campus life. There has been during the past decades perhaps too much talk about unifying the experience of students through common courses or common examinations and not enough discussion of the unification of student experience through an effort to relate all kinds of activities that do and should occur on a campus.

Finally, what initial impact does the college make on the entering student? Our third and fourth year students are carefully put into the hands of a department which in a sense is their home and yet we leave our first year students untended by any structure; they are not regarded as a part of any academic or intellectually-centered institution on campus. Orientation and advising are extra-curricular events; entrance into the active life of learning is limited to occasional lectures and classroom work alone. (The College of Engineering and the College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences, it may be noted, make a more significant effort to solve these problems than does Rutgers College.)

I therefore recommend the establishment of four separate schools in Rutgers College:

The School of Humanistic Studies
The School of Social Studies
The School of Scientific Studies
The School of Applied Scientific Studies

Student Membership in the Schools

1. At the time of application for admission each student would be asked to specify which school he wished to join on the basis of his current interests and views of his own future. This would require no great adjustment in admissions procedures unless the faculty decided that it would like to achieve a different student mix than currently exists. There is no reason to assume that all Schools would have to be the same size, unless the faculty thought this desirable. As the situation now is, the School of Scientific Studies would probably be larger than the others (almost 50% of our entering arts and science students indicate an interest in the sciences and roughly 80% of that number do finish with a major in one of the sciences) and the School of Humanistic Studies would be the smallest. The size of first-year groups in the Schools would presumably be between 250 and 450 students.

The Schools might be used in other ways during admissions. In some ways the present undergraduate body is often as uninteresting as it is able because it is too homogeneous. It might be possible under the School scheme to recruit and to admit students who have special qualities that might recommend them especially for admission to one of the schools while in overall college-wide competition for admission they might not fare as well.

In no way does this proposal suggest separate admissions policies; it does offer the option of some adjustments within that general policy, however, as well as an opportunity to reexamine and rethink that whole complex question for the college.

2. Students on entering the college would be housed together in dormitory facilities designated as the physical site of the School to which they have been admitted. It would house the main offices of the School; its social facilities would also be those of the School. The organization of the dorm and much of its life would become the responsibility of the officials of the School. Facilities ought to be provided for commuters (lockers in the dormitories, a place to stay over night on occasion, etc.) as well. Such a physical arrangement would provide for a meaning for dormitory living and relate it to the basic educational work of the college; it would provide a natural source of student identification, the first step in giving them a sense of over-all identification with the college.

3. Students living in the dormitories would be organized into sections. Commuters, too, who are members of a School would be organized into similar sections as would any second-year students who elected not to live on campus. The sections, in addition to other traditional dormitory purposes, would be used as a basic unit of School organization. In several meetings held each semester, for example, sections would discuss with a Fellow or Fellows of the School matters of common interest about the programs at Rutgers College, about educational possibilities, possible course elections, the whole range of subjects that are part of orientation and advising.

4. The School of Applied Scientific Studies is intended primarily for students who propose to major in Engineering or Agriculture and Environmental Sciences. It is by no means an effort to segregate such students but rather to provide them a meaningful membership within Rutgers College. This is very important if any sense at all can be made of this strange arrangement that places such students (and faculty members) within the College but in effect allows for no meaningful academic relationship between them and other students and faculty in the College.

5. Entrance into a particular School would not mean firm commitment to remain in it. A student might transfer in his second year; normally such second year students would continue to be regarded as members of the School, participants in sections and section meetings in the School. The School would function as the locus of student academic association, advising, and

orientation until the election of the major. Clearly, no second year student would have to reside in the School but it ought to remain a center for some of his activities. Upperclassmen would also continue to play a role in the School to which their major field belonged.

Official Direction of the School

1. Directions of the operations of the Schools would be put into the hands of a group of faculty and students to be known as the Fellows of the School.

2. The Fellows would be elected by the participating departments. Each department would have three representatives among the Fellows: it would elect a faculty member, a graduate student serving as a teaching assistant and otherwise involved in instruction in a first or second year course given in the department, and an honor's candidate upperclassman. In all cases election as a Fellow would be regarded as a special honor. The terms of faculty members would be limited to three years; of student members (both graduate and upperclass) one year.

3. Executive authority in each School would be entrusted to a Senior Fellow to be appointed out of the faculty by the Dean of the College for a term of five years.

4. The Senior Fellow would maintain an office in the School. Other office space should be made available for other Fellows if possible. Teaching assistants and upperclassmen elected as Fellows might reside in the dormitories and serve as preceptors; this would be most desirable to achieve the fullest effect from the School scheme.

Departmental Representation

1. Each department would decide in which of the Schools it wishes to be represented. This is left deliberately as is, therefore, the precise number of fellows in any School. There are some departments that might wish to be members of more than one School: history, perhaps, in both the School of Humanistic Studies and the School of Social Studies; psychology in the School of Scientific Studies and the School of Social Sciences; philosophy in all Schools. Such diversity would have intellectual as well as organizational advantages. Students ought to know that there are in fact different ways of viewing some disciplines. Further, a student who thought of history as a social science would almost certainly take a different program than one who wished to approach it as a humanistic subject. The very raising of the question of the proper context for a discipline is a significant part of the educational

process. The very idea of the eventual major field gets examined in a new and important light.

2. The representation of various departments within the School makes it possible for the student with some general interest in an area to learn more about specific disciplines with which he might be unfamiliar. The School thus serves a special orientation function.

3. All faculty members in the college would obviously constitute the full faculty of the Schools and every faculty member would be encouraged to participate in the life of the School with which he most especially wished to identify. While direction of the Schools would be in the hands of the Fellows, those faculty members responsible for the introductory (first and second year) work in the various departments should, if not elected as Fellows, serve with the Fellows in an ex-officio capacity. In this way all faculty responsible directly for the education of undergraduates could play a significant role in the Schools. But all faculty should be encouraged to participate in the life of the Schools.

Function of the Fellows

1. The initial purpose of the Schools is to provide basic orientation to the college. This is not merely thought of as a series of introductory activities at the start of the school year but rather as a program devised and run by the Fellows to operate throughout the years. The Schools might open several days or a week earlier than the rest of the College, but the primary idea here is to extend the notion of orientation and make it a part of the continuing process of education. It is easier and more effective to work with groups of this size. We do have rooms on campus that can contain pleasantly the whole first-year group of a School and the basic unit of the dormitory section provides an already organized body for small group meetings. The School provides a way of learning about the college and about various disciplines in which the student is likely to be interested without making the operation of orientation a special, extracurricular matter. Sources of information would be close at hand; consultation would be more natural and easy.

2. The same holds true for the advising function. The Board of Freshman Advisers, for all its improved work, remains one of the most frequently criticized operations on campus. This is almost inevitable, for it remains too separate from the normal routine and life of the students, too much outside the processes of education itself. This proposal puts first and second year advising into the Schools and under the direction of the Fellows. Note that the Fellows are both students and faculty and

that the graduate students will be teachers in the basic courses many Freshmen and Sophomores will be taking or honor students in various departments. Advising becomes a more natural function when advanced students are part of the process. The Fellows would be more easily and directly available (especially if the student Fellows are preceptors). The existence of office space for at least the Senior Fellow and hopefully other Fellows as well makes them more readily accessible. In addition, the organization of the sections for resident and non-resident members of the School alike provides the basis for at least two formal meetings each semester by the small group for the discussion of key educational issues in which faculty and student fellows participate and in which questions are raised, hopefully on a more significant level than the discussion of requirements.

3. The arrangement of the Schools, the establishment of a body of Fellows from a variety of disciplines, and the effort to involve as many faculty members as possible suggest that the Schools might serve as an institutional center encouraging inter-disciplinary discussion and even study. No such agency now exists on campus and more than a few faculty members and students have complained about the difficulties involved in achieving such an inter-disciplinary give-and-take.

4. There is nothing in this proposal that calls for the development of special inter-disciplinary courses. Many students and faculty are convinced that such courses are necessary and valuable; they are, however, difficult to organize and even more difficult to sustain over an extended period. I have my own serious doubts about such ventures and the national record in this area is not encouraging. I am not proposing any such courses in this report. However, the very existence of a School might very well lead to experimental non-credit seminars or courses; it might lead to proposals for new inter-disciplinary courses that would be accepted as part of the regular college program. Thus, the very idea of the School and the operation of the Fellows might lead to serious rethinking of educational matters and to changes in programs and policies. People from different disciplines would be encouraged to discuss not only curriculum but also matters of genuine inter-disciplinary interest. Thus it might ultimately be possible for the School to propose to the College that it offer courses under its own auspices or even an upperclass major in the broader field represented by the School itself.

5. Serious discussion of educational issues with students and among the Fellows might lead to an effective review of what various departments are doing in their introductory courses. Departmental autonomy has meant

that basic courses are strictly the business of the department. Yet other departments (which would generally be found in the same School) frequently have valuable criticism to offer of such courses in terms of their usefulness to their own students.

6. The existence of the Schools would open up for consideration the possible appointment of members of the faculty who might not be members of any particular department or might be members of more than one department. The Fellows might recommend to the Dean the appointment of someone to serve in the School who would in fact prefer such an appointment. There are distinguished figures at least in the areas of the Social Sciences and Humanities, for example, who wish not to commit themselves to a particular discipline or even to participate in the training of graduate students. In the sharply professionally-oriented world of higher education in the United States such men frequently have difficulty gaining the kind of academic posts they desire. Such an individual might, in some circumstances, be sought as Senior Fellow for one of the Schools. Most probably, he would elect to concentrate his energies on undergraduate and college work. Such appointments might make a special contribution to general education in the College.

7. All of these functions discussed above stress possibilities. The entire program is based on a vision of flexibility and growth. There is no effort to insist on rules, regulations, fixed categories or methods of operation. Each School, in fact, might develop its own way of doing things, its own traditions. For the Schools to be effective they must not become simply new forms and new rules, another institutional hurdle to education.

Relationship with Existing Structures

1. In assuming special functions with reference to orientation and advising it is by no means suggested that the Schools will eliminate the need for and the functions of existing officers and operations within the office of the Dean of the College or the Dean of Students. It is assumed that such officials will play an important role in correlating and balancing the work of the Schools. Most especially, this role will become important in over-seeing interaction and intercommunication among the four schools with the help of the four Senior Fellows concerned. There is clearly a danger that such Schools might become too isolated and that the students might lose the opportunity to meet people of other interests and learn about other disciplines and programs. The over-all success of the School scheme depends upon the development of a program of interaction between Schools. This would be especially imperative in areas of

orientation and advising.

2. The same thing holds true about the organization of the dormitories. Establishment of policies, so far as the Schools are concerned, would obviously be in the hands of the Fellows but the administration and operation would continue to be under the direction of the regular authorities now exercising those functions.

Dormitory Arrangements

Since the School proposal seriously brings into question the whole matter of dormitory policy, I offer the following recommendations:

1. In the housing of all first-year students, all preceptors in those dormitories be Fellows of the Schools in question or else be appointed by and responsible to the Fellows.

2. All dormitories might well continue to be organized according to Schools. But from the second year all preceptors in the residence halls should be elected by the individual sections from the membership of the section itself. This is in keeping with the basic spirit of this report that students must assume more responsibility for their own educational planning with the very best advice and in the very best academic and social environment we can provide. If they are not mature enough to undertake such tasks, then we must take a new look at our admissions policies. I believe they are mature enough, however, and that such procedures as suggested make good sense after the first year. It is no secret that the preceptor system has come under heavy criticism from the students, but in any case it is based on assumptions no longer pertinent in today's college situation. This proposal does not mean license; preceptors will still be responsible but more than this the fullest sense of responsibility will now have to rest on every member of the section.

3. The sections ought to be meaningful as social, cultural, and intellectual groups, without so rigid an organization and so detailed a program of activities that young men can't be young men. Rather, students in the residence halls ought to be encouraged to work out programs of their own for their section or group of sections if not for whole dorms of Schools. They can best do this under their own leadership with the help of the Fellows of the School. Students talk frequently about courses they want that are not given in the college; about having discussions of books not read in regular classes. A section could be organized because a group of young men had some joint project they wished to undertake, or a section could develop

some such program for itself. We must make life in the residence halls significant in meeting some of the interests and needs of the students and we must invite commuters to share in that life as much as possible. Therefore, young men living in the residence halls should be encouraged to form their own living units under their own leadership.

4. Those students who do not want to continue to live in a School but do wish to live in the residence halls may do so, although in filling dormitory places School requests should come first. The same provisions would apply to these students as suggested above: their own organization and their own leadership, their own activities or their own lack of activities. Upperclassmen especially should have the opportunity not to be organized (even by an organization of their own) and not to be active if they wish. They can live alone and like it. But at the same time they should have an opportunity to see how valuable an experience dormitory living might be when ordered and organized by students themselves in keeping with their own interests.

The Practical Issues

I have not concerned myself with many of the obvious practical issues that are involved in the School proposal and the suggestions about the residence halls. I believe they can be solved. Obviously, for example, it is expected that faculty Fellows spend considerable time in the Schools. It is possible that some teaching load adjustment would have to be made or additional remuneration paid (as is the case currently with the Board of Freshmen Advisors). Teaching Assistants might also be relieved of some departmental responsibilities. There is the possibility for all student Fellows involved of remuneration of the kind currently given preceptors in the dormitories.

The question of physical arrangements in the residence halls and the working out of elaborate housing plans calls for considerable time and study but people in these areas who have been consulted think that the plan is feasible. It would take at least two years to make the complete changes I am proposing but some significant steps toward experimental implementation could be begun as early as next year.

Conclusion

These changes would add to what we now have in the college and do not try to alter present structures that work sufficiently well. The basic structure of the new scheme is not too rigid; there are exciting possibilities of independent growth of the new Schools and of interdisciplinary action along novel lines.

We do not put a new curriculum or a new set of rules and regulations in place of the old but increase opportunities for growth, discussion, and thought on campus. We bring faculty members into closer contact and cooperation; we bring students into closer contact and cooperation with the faculty as part of initial college experience. We make upperclassmen and graduate students a part of the academic life of less advanced students. We make orientation and advising an integral part of campus living; we relate dormitory life and the "other" life that goes on on the campus. We begin to provide a significant core of experience, social, intellectual, perhaps even cultural, for students, so from the outset they can identify with part of the college and ultimately with the college as a whole.

RECOMMENDATION: THE TIME FACTOR

Perhaps the most remarkable thing about the whole concept of a college education is the fact that young men and women, removed from the immediate supervision of home and family, are given four years with no other responsibilities than to prepare themselves, intellectually, socially, emotionally, for roles in society and personal life they themselves elect. This particular period in their lives, moreover, is a most significant one: they are young adults, emerging from adolescence, anxiously trying to discover who and what they are. The existence of four years of relative freedom ought therefore to be an extraordinarily fruitful time for them, a special gift and a blessing.

It is imperative that some notion of the importance of this time as time is considered in any effort to define what we mean by a liberal education. So concerned are we with what must go on in the classroom and how much learning must be required that few have considered the function of free time within the academic program. Few have realized that we have, regulation by regulation, course by course addition, weakened the overall value of four years of freedom for development and learning.

One of my major objections to the current Biological Science program and the main reason I regard it as not in keeping with the tradition of the liberal arts is not that the students enrolled take too many science courses, for there is nothing illiberal in a proper program of scientific study. What is illiberal about the program is the extraordinary time demands it makes on the student and how little opportunity for personal intellectual and self-development it allows the average student in that program. But in a sense almost all students at Rutgers College are put in similar circumstances at least during some seasons of the year. We have been so concerned about "educating" students that we have cut down their opportunity to think about what they are learning, to read something not required in a course, to experience works of art and music not a part of their programs, to discover something about areas of experience and modes of dealing with them in fields they are not "taking."

There is simply no real learning without reflection. Students may indeed do very well under pressure in passing a set of examinations in a course but it is doubtful that much of any significance will be retained unless the student has taken time to reflect and ponder. Skills can be taught by making things habitual; meaning cannot be obtained from training. Frequently, faculty as well as students demand that there must be more integration of various kinds of knowledge but rarely is the student given sufficient time or therefore the encouragement to make this effort on his own. Many courses feel a responsibility to "cover" the field rather than to "uncover" it.

Specialization is not really the enemy; a balance can be achieved between the requirements of the specialist and a more general view of education. Specialization must, indeed, be kept in check but most important of all we must give some attention to the problem of time distribution during undergraduate years. The threat of specialization has led, in fact, to a most peculiar solution: the proliferation of requirements which so over-burden the student that he finds himself unable to spend enough time with any course to learn it well. He "takes" a variety of courses but this too often means he is in fact simply taking courses, for he cannot spend the time, energy, and reflection on a whole range of different subjects. And ironically we make the most severe demands in this regard in the earliest years of the college career. We thereby encourage superficiality; we discourage reflection; we turn from intellectual challenges to races against the clock and the schedule.

The time factor also plays a more significant role; instead of the college degree being a qualitative expression, evidence of intellectual achievement, it is too frequently a mere quantitative expression: Having put in time and accumulated credit for hours of work and not having upset anyone too much along the way, the undergraduate is awarded a degree. This is still something of a caricature, but it is becoming more and more a picture of reality as the mass quality of education grows.

The following recommendations are made in a modest effort to begin to get at these problems:

1. That four courses be considered a normal load for all students.

This recommendation means little if every instructor greatly increases the work required in his course. The proposal is meant to provide a chance to concentrate on fewer courses, to provide more time for reflection on these courses, and also to free student time for other kinds of intellectual and social activities. While many students will of course waste leisure time, not all will do so. If we create the proper environment on campus, few students will throw away the rich possibilities such leisure might offer--and who is to say what constitutes a waste of time anyway?

2. That the college no longer count hours for credits but substitute instead courses.

3. That 32 semester courses represent the normal number of courses required for graduation.

It is important that we minimize the bookkeeping aspect of education as much as possible. Ideally, I would propose a system in which course accumulation of any kind was irrelevant and the college substitute completely some examination device to see whether, after a serious program of study, a student was worthy of a degree. I believe that system is not possible here although it might be feasible in a smaller college. But the compromise I propose leads in the right direction. Most courses ought to be tailored to be equivalent; the stress should be on what is learned and not the hours it took to learn it. Thus the attitude of the college as reflected in its view about the equality of courses puts the stress on learning where it ought to be.

Obviously, such equality may not always be feasible and since it is essential that the course framework be as flexible as possible to meet a variety of needs, I further recommend:

4. That the college authorize the existence of four types of courses:

a. Full Course: the basic unit; most semester courses would be regarded as full courses.

b. Half Course: a course running for the full semester whose content and work are clearly recognizable as only half of what a full course requires. Many laboratories, for example, might be organized as such half courses.

c. Mini-Course: a half course but one that would in effect be given full time for half a semester (that is, two mini-courses could be given in sequence during the same semester). The course would run roughly seven weeks. Among other advantages, it provides some of what many people like about the quarter system without requiring that the whole college move to such a new schedule. Obviously, such courses would provide greater flexibility.

d. Maxi-Course: students, with the consent of the instructor, may elect to take any course for double credit. No student could enroll in more than one such course in any semester.

The additional work a student would do would depend on the arrangements he worked out with his instructor. He might wish to read more extensively; he might wish to undertake an additional research assignment; he might try to read not so much in depth as in scope, trying to put the study in which the class was engaged into a broader context. Studies in depth of breadth done in connection with on-going courses might well provide a most effective kind of independent study--independent and yet not totally detached from direction.

Other consequences of a four-course student load could make meaningful the use of extra-class time as a basis for a real liberal arts environment on campus. Most especially the question of faculty teaching load which has a genuine bearing on the over-all academic situation takes on a different look. No one doubts that the current faculty loads are generally too heavy in the college. Such burdens add to the difficulty of faculty participation in a variety of campus projects that might be desirable. The time has come to reconsider the whole question of faculty loads, not merely in terms of equity--and there are striking differences in load from department to department and even within departments--but also in terms of the relationship between such loads and the quality of a liberal education. For free faculty time--at least free of certain classroom obligations--can also make a significant contribution to the structure of a proper academic environment if it makes the faculty available for other functions. I propose therefore:

5. That the Dean of the College make every effort to assess the faculty load situation as it will exist under the four-course-student-load system to see whether under such a new arrangement it is possible to begin gradual reduction of normal teaching loads on campus to two courses. I would further propose that in the course of moving toward a lighter load initial consideration be given to those members of the faculty who are asked or are willing to assume other duties and obligations in the college (many of which are proposed in this report). While it is possible that reduction of student load will make possible reduction of faculty loads, it would be a mistake for the college not to require of faculty members increased service to the college. Otherwise, too many members of the faculty will spend only half of their time in the college and the other half in the Graduate School; the college would thus be short-changed.

If the scheme for reduction of load is carried out there should be still one other consequence of importance. In almost every statement about education at Rutgers published over the past two decades and indeed almost every statement about higher education published in the United States in the same period, spokesmen have bemoaned the proliferation of courses and have called repeatedly for some rollback in the number of courses offered. As far as I am aware such statements have in no way achieved the desired results. If we limit student load and begin to limit faculty load as well it might very well follow (unless there is a large increase in the size of the faculty which is not very likely) that there will have to be some readjustment in the number of courses. I urge departments to reconsider their total offerings, not merely to eliminate some courses, to alternate them, but also to see whether some courses could not be condensed from full year courses to semester courses. If indeed our aim is not coverage but the introduction to a kind of experience or phenomenon and a mode of understanding it, surely it should be possible to deal with some matters currently handled in a year course in a semester.

There remains the important issue of total time spent at college. The institution of the four year college course as we have it is largely an American development. There is sufficient evidence that it works rather well and therefore I have no desire to suggest a radical change in the normal pattern.

But it ought to be regarded as just that, the normal pattern. There ought to be options available; individual needs and differences, changes in circumstances, personal, intellectual, and social, ought to allow modifications in that pattern. I propose, therefore:

6. That students entering Rutgers College expect to spend from 3 to 5 years to earn undergraduate degrees although generally students take four years to complete their work.

a. Through the use of advanced placement, college proficiency examinations, comprehensive examinations in departments, and other such devices it might be possible for a student to complete his work in three years. Obviously, this would be an exceptional case and would require advice from the departments concerned and from other officers of the college. There are some students who would benefit by being allowed to undertake more specialized or professional work sooner. The college would have to be satisfied that in the 3 years in residence the student received what amounted to an equivalent education to those who undertook the normal four year pattern.

b. More common will be those students who can benefit from having more time to complete their work, but no more than five years. Included in this group are some students who need to take a lighter load than average at the start of their college career or later to do work worthy of them and to get the most out of their college experience. High school guidance people, admissions officials, members of the faculty might recommend such special treatment in unusual cases.

c. There are some students who feel for one reason or another that they need a respite from course taking. It is currently possible for students to take leave. That is not quite what I am proposing. I recommend that the college institute a category of student registration which will allow a student to remain on campus for one semester, engaging in what aspects of campus life he wishes but without having to enroll either in a full program or courses or even for any regular classes. A student might have a project he wishes to pursue, some reading he wishes to do, some social service that becomes an all-consuming interest. He ought to be able to interrupt his formal (that is classroom) education and yet retain his intellectual and social ties on campus, the use of college facilities (including the residence halls). Such one-semester "leaves" might be psychologically and intellectually refreshing. They would be open to any students in the last three years of college who had the consent of his School or his department through his adviser and of the Dean.

So convinced am I of the value of the program for student leaves that I propose:

c. That the colleges establish an institution on campus in one of the residence units to be known as The Withdrawal Center. Since there are moments when we all ought to withdraw from what has been our routine but not necessarily from the context in which we normally operate, such an opportunity could be offered to 12 second or third year students every year. (The figure is arbitrary; the question of financing such a program as proposed has not been seriously investigated.) The college would undertake to provide room and board; the students would be housed together. To be eligible, a student would have to submit in some detail a proposal for the work he wished to undertake during his semester at the Center. These projects could be for individual study, research, or creative work; they could be for programs of social activism outside the campus; they could be for the development of curricular or other changes on the campus. These proposals would be submitted to a special student-faculty committee for judging and final selection.

The Center would be a "Think Tank" for students and one might expect that the Center itself and its student members would play a significant role on campus. I would hope, further, that funds could be found so that students at the Center would be free to invite as guests of the Center, to remain with them for a limited time or even for the full semester, young scholars and activists in whom our students were especially interested, who shared fundamental concerns with them, whose ways of looking at the world especially intrigued them. I am thinking most particularly of the "under-30" group, young men elsewhere on campuses or active in the world who also might benefit from such association and from the facilities available on our campus.

It is important to give these young men a chance to think through problems in which they are especially interested, to try to put these problems in meaningful intellectual form, to talk them out fully without having to pretend at the same time to attend class and do normal work. Ideas of value might result; the experience itself would be of significance for the individual students and would be shared ultimately with the rest of the campus; the return to regular campus life might come with a new eagerness and perhaps a great commitment, with less need to take time and energy away from other intellectual pursuits.

Students would be selected during the Fall semester and the Center would operate every Spring semester. No student would be eligible for more than one semester at the Center. There would be no academic credit and obviously for most students it would mean graduation would be postponed for a semester.

I hope these few suggestions about the time factor will open the way to still more discussion and suggestions for I am convinced that a more flexible view of time might well help us toward a total vision of what a liberal education means.

RECOMMENDATION: THE EXPLORATORY SEMESTERS

The Freshman Year

There is no greater shortcoming in our present system than our Freshman program--or rather lack or program. Entering students are generally herded into a series of courses, given few options and little explanation for electing the courses they finally find themselves in. Most of their courses are required; they are usually "introductory" in the worst sense of the word. They often are very large lecture classes. The courses are usually very different from each other, and the student has great difficulty in making sense out of them. They demand of him the development of different techniques or skills but rarely offer him an intellectual challenge. The Freshman year becomes thus one of endurance rather than of excitement; the student, to survive and to propser, develops precisely the wrong set of attitudes. He learns that the game consists in passing courses and meeting deadlines. He senses that intellectual effort is less important than developing a set of survival skills; he hangs on, hoping for something better when he gets to be an upperclassman.

Furthermore, although the setting is different from high school, the methods of instruction slightly different, and the content of courses different or at least more difficult, it is fundamentally more of the same; he has been through it all before. He had expected that college would be different; he had anticipated intellectual challenge and had a vision of the life of the mind not satisfied by most of his classroom work. He grows cold to the whole ideal of intellectual pursuits: if he remains, he fastens on even more tenaciously to some extra-intellectual goal, a good job, admission to medical school or to graduate school. His courses become only the means to an end and rarely take on any personal significance for him (this is precisely what is involved in some of the student complaints about "relevance"). Having dashed the students' hopes and ideals during their first year, the faculty then proceeds to bemoan student apathy in upperclass work. Why should they not be apathetic? The first-year work has succeeded in turning students off.

As if these difficulties were not enough, students arrive with limited understanding of what they wish to do with themselves during their college years. Yet the ways open to them to find out about fields of study are very limited indeed. They can receive some vague and abstract information in orientation sessions; they can perhaps take a course, which means a commitment of time and energy that denies them the opportunity to try something else; they can rely on the often-accurate grapevine to tell them what are the best courses, departments, and teachers (happily, they now have a much better source in the excellent Course and Teacher Evaluation booklet so ably prepared by a committee of the Student Council last spring.) We know that it is almost the rule rather than the exception for students, especially in the non-science fields, to change their major from the one they indicated on entrance. But the procedure itself is too haphazard and the student receives too little help in the process of choosing an intelligent program and college career. The School scheme is designed in large part to help in this area but that is just a beginning.

These conditions are not unique to Rutgers College. They are in fact universal concerns of those interested in higher education. Many other places at least show concern. However, here the faculty has been satisfied to set a series of general education requirements and organize a series of introductory courses within individual disciplines and let the students flounder as best they can before they are able to select a major.

And yet we know how very important the initial years are, especially the first year, in setting habits of mind and in shaping the whole personal and intellectual development of the student. The literature of the field suggests a good deal of agreement about what the first-year student generally needs. They need a transition from the high school; college must be different and it must not fail the expectation the entering student has of college study. We know he needs variety, that he does not adapt to year-long courses in the same subject as well as he does to changes in courses and approach. We know that he needs to feel a growing confidence in his own ability to make intelligent choices on his own, grounded in firm knowledge and advice wisely given. We know he needs to feel some easing of the pressure of competition after the rat race of the college admission struggle. At Rutgers College he also needs to know that he is entering a special and exciting place,that this is not just a college that accepted him when he couldn't get into the college he really wanted.

In light of these needs, I propose that we regard the first semester of a student's college career as an Exploratory Semester in which the student makes the transition to college life and areas of varied intellectual challenges are opened up for him to explore. I therefore make these recommendations:

1. Half of a student's program should be given over in the Exploratory Semester to the taking of a series of Mini-Courses in a variety of fields. These would be seminar-type classes with limited student enrollment of no more than 20 students and would last for 6 or 7 weeks. During his Exploratory Semester each student would be able to select 4 such Mini-Courses. This would provide him with a brief introduction to four different areas of inquiry and analysis. Such courses would obviously not be thorough introductions to a discipline; rather they would present the student with a sense of the kind of problem, the kind of evidence, the kind of method and analysis used in the discipline. For example, he might spend the entire course carefully reading, analyzing, and discussing a single major work, classic or contemporary, or a series of major papers. He would learn to read closely and to read thoughtfully. He would develop some sense of the intellectual adventure involved for those in that discipline. He would learn the excitement of discovery and more important he would find himself raising questions and developing critical attitudes. The experience itself would provide valuable training for later college work, whether in one of the disciplines involved in the Mini-Course program or not.

2. Such courses should be made available from every possible field, including those represented in the college in Engineering and in Agriculture and Environmental Sciences. There is no reason why some work in basic problems in engineering design cannot be presented to Freshmen, even those not thinking of a career in engineering; there is no reason an area like conservation could not provide a most significant Mini-Course. I would like to see many courses offered from every department and area in the college. Obviously, the proposal calls for a great number of such courses, perhaps as many as 150 or even 200 at any one time. Such a program will take considerable time and organization to achieve but it is quite possible if the faculty is willing and the departments cooperate. At first we might have to rely on volunteers willing to undertake this kind of teaching, but not all of the courses would have to be manned by regular faculty. Departments might very well use some of the more advanced and able graduate student teaching assistants. The college might also turn to some of the more outstanding seniors as well. I have long thought that there were many able undergraduates who might very well learn a good deal at the same time they were involved in teaching others and I would recommend some experimentation along these lines. The point to remember is what a fascinating and special kind of teaching this would be, a small discussion-type class meeting for only 6 or 7 weeks with no obligation to cover material or prepare students for examinations.

3. The arrangement for such Mini-Courses should be placed in the hands of the Fellows of each School and while the courses would be offered by the departments and their personnel the School would serve as clearinghouse.

4. No student should be allowed to take more than two such courses in the same School and only one in any department. If there is to be real exploration, he should also take at least one such course from at least each of two of the other Schools. (That is, if he is in the School of Social Studies he must take one Mini-Course in each of two of the following Schools: Humanistic Studies, Scientific Studies, Applied Scientific Studies.)

5. Such courses should stress careful reading, discussion, and perhaps a limited amount of writing. The intellectual challenge, the raising of critical questions, the exploration of a largely unknown field of knowledge or possibly an unknown method of dealing with experience would be the aim of these courses. There should be no pretense that such an Exploratory Mini-Course would attempt to "cover" a field; it would rather be an introduction to a kind of inquiry. The experience in such a course ought also to provide another opportunity for advising and orientation within the setting of an academic enterprise itself. A Student will come into easy and natural contact with someone--his teacher in the course--with whom he can discuss his future program, the possibilities and requirements for further work in the particular field of the course, and similar matters.

6. While the student should be free to select the remainder of the work for the semester from the courses available to him in the college, he should take, during the first or second semester of his Freshman year, one semester of English, a required, rigorous course in rhetoric as is currently offered in English 101. There is reason to believe that some students might benefit from the flexibility obtained by delaying such a course until the second semester. In some cases more experience in the college and possibly in the Mini-Courses themselves could give the student a greater sense of confidence and of his need for the training provided in Freshman English. In exceptional cases, students might be exempted from such a course on the basis of a proficiency examination, but the value of such experience for all first-year students is sufficiently significant, if only because it establishes clearly what standards the college demands in prose writing, that this requirement should be maintained. While students should have any number of opportunities to develop their writing skills in papers in other courses in the college, only such a course in rhetoric provides the opportunity to examine with critical awareness language as language, writing as a distinct act of communication. But one semester should be sufficient for this purpose and

rather than a second semester, we should make some effort to stress writing in a wide variety of courses.

A brief aside is pertinent here. Obviously, the reduction in the English composition requirement suggests a serious problem about staff. What happens to all of those who would normally be engaged in teaching two semesters of the course? A basic principle of this report is that elimination of required work for students should not lead to staff reduction; the report was not commissioned to save the college money. Rather, such changes in the structure of requirements should be viewed as opportunities to use personnel, regular staff and teaching assistants, for different and more interesting programs. For example, in the case of English composition currently being discussed it would be possible for those who might normally teach the second semester to offer sections of it as electives, arranging in effect a series of small Freshman and maybe Sophomore courses with different topics for reading, discussion, and writing listed for different sections. Some instructors might be assigned outside the department of English itself to the staff of some of the very large Freshman and Sophomore courses offered in other departments where some written work is demanded and where the expert assistance of members of the English composition staff might be very welcome. The quality of writing in the college might improve considerably if such assistance were in fact made available to other departments who might ask for it. Writing is not something that is confined to the English department. Or the English department itself might now find it possible to section some of its especially large courses and provide more adequately for small group instruction within the department.

The elimination of requirements should not be looked at as a threat to staff maintenance but rather as a challenge to any department for more effective use of personnel.

7. Students should be given no grades for work during the Exploratory Semester (or for Freshman English even if it is taken during the second semester.) I propose that we remove the obvious pressure of grades and competition and that we rely as much as possible on instructors' statements (verbal or written) about the quality of a student's work.

This is most important because of the tone it sets for the student, the stress that is placed on learning and the deemphasis of the bookkeeping approach to education. Students will probably be taking one or possibly two additional courses during the semester (depending on whether they elect English 101 in the first or second semester). These courses will in many cases be our regular large lecture introductory courses or perhaps a course in language. Obviously, mastery will be necessary if a student is to be expected to undertake a second semester in the same course or any advanced work in that field. But it remains possible to inform a student if he is able to proceed in the course or to indicate the nature of his progress or the lack of it without recording grades.

The Exploratory Semester, despite its practical problems, would begin to meet some of the needs that Freshmen have, and it would give Rutgers College a very special program. Especially if combined with the basic School scheme, it would create distinctiveness in our underclass system. I am urging, of course, that students in the School of Applied Scientific Studies as well as those in the other Schools have the advantage of an Exploratory Semester. I think such consistency would be of considerable value for identification. What is more, while the present Colleges of Engineering and Agriculture and Environmental Sciences run excellent orientation programs for their own students, it would be of great value for them to know something of other disciplines, just as it would be of value for our students to know something about their work. It is just as important for their students to know something of the work done in other departments of the college, to explore not only because of intellectual curiosity but because they might themselves discover an interest unknown previously.

An Additional Freshman Option: Early Concentration

One more observation and one more proposal: The Exploratory Semester is much better suited to the needs of our diverse Freshman than the current system but it is obviously not necessarily an adequate program for all entering students. There are many on this faculty who believe that the answer can better be found in some common-core program and I did investigate such possibilities. It seemed to me not feasible given the definition of the situation at Rutgers College but the School proposal might lead in the direction of the development of several possible core-type programs over the years and several of the new programs recommended later in this report might also serve that same function. But one other option for students who enter with special gifts and special interests does make sense most especially because it has worked successfully at other institutions. I therefore recommend that:

The college agrees to the possibility of early concentration for exceptional students. Thus a student who wished to devote himself almost exclusively, say, to the study of mathematics would be allowed to do so. He would not follow the normal Freshman pattern detailed above (although he would obviously participate in a School as a member). He would ultimately have to arrange his program during the remaining years to satisfy whatever conditions the college puts on all its students, but the college would make every effort to encourage his initial enthusiasm, not to dampen it. Such early concentration would be rare and would be allowed only after the most careful consultation of parents, high school guidance personnel, the college staff, and the department or departments in question.

Introductory Courses: Some Questions

The discussion of the Freshman year calls for some comment on the introductory courses. It is obvious that the adoption of the Exploratory Semester would mean fewer year-long introductory courses would be taken by Freshmen. This would be in contradiction to current practices and arrangements in many departments that count on large introductory courses. This scheme, coupled with the decline in number of courses in a normal load and further recommendations about general education requirements, might therefore seem dangerous to many departments. But even without these factors, my study of the college pointed up a series of troublesome questions that deserve serious consideration and study.

1. There remains a serious question about the kind of introduction many first courses give. A strange phenomenon has already occurred in the sciences: a series of "introductory" courses has been established, each for a different audience. The reason why is obvious but the intellectual issue remains: Isn't there a way to introduce the subject as subject, the phenomena and experience studied, the kinds of evidence and methods of analysis used, without creating special "introductions" for special groups? Some students, of course, will have to acquire some kinds of information and some special skills for particular purposes, but is this the same thing as introducing the subject? What happens to these courses as liberal arts courses? In other areas we have 200-level "introductory" courses generally intended for upperclassmen who were unable to take a 100-level course, for example, as a senior. This again makes little intellectual sense: an introduction is an introduction, whether intended for Freshmen or Seniors (interestingly enough, it often seems possible to reduce the introductory course for the Seniors to one semester!). This proliferation of basic courses supposedly tailored for individual group interests raises serious intellectual issues.

2. Should this policy, for example, be extended to all disciplines? Ought the same course intended as an introduction for major students serve students who simply want some background in the field? One of the very best teachers in the college who is widely admired by the students. told me that increasingly students in his

introductory course object to the orderly and disciplined kind of analysis and learning that have become hallmarks of his discipline. The students, he suggested, are interested in other problems and less rigorous analysis. Yet obviously he cannot give future majors any other kind of course than that dictated by the best and latest work in his discipline. Do we need different introductory courses in the Social Sciences and the Humanities for majors and non-majors?

3. Are the introductory courses primarily designed as devices for enrollment management? Too many departments stress this function almost to the exclusion of other values. I am perfectly aware that such an issue is important and that some devices may be necessary to assure proper distribution of students. But emphasis upon "bread and butter" courses as essential to the building of a large upperclass program or more especially as vital to the creation, through the use of teaching assistants, of a large graduate student body in the department contributes little to the solution of more basic educational issues in the college. Courses must be justified primarily by their value to students in the college as part of an effective liberal arts program.

4. Is is impossible to provide any kind of meaningful introduction to any discipline in one semester? Time and time again I discovered that many so-called introductory courses were stressing increased information at the price of basic understanding of the discipline, its materials, problems, methods. To be sure, no discipline can demonstrate itself without materials on which to work. This is the value of doing a science rather than studying about scientific procedure in a course in philosophy of science. But information and data on which to operate does not mean wide coverage. Would not a one-semester general introductory course that can serve all students, followed by second or even third semesters especially developed for the potential major in the field or other special users of the field, make sense?

The Senior Year

There is another period of significant transition that is seldom treated as such in our current curriculum. Students preparing to move from the college into the larger world of work and into some still more specialized world of advanced study need some genuine opportunity to stop and reflect, to see just what they have learned and what it all means, how it all relates, to see how it might affect the future. Thus, I would suggest that we designate the last semester in residence also as an Exploratory Semester, exploring now not the challenge of the college but that of the future, personally and socially.

Here the proposals are deliberately more vague. It should be possible for the student to devote up to one-half of his course work to exploration; there should be no grades recorded and all of the work of the final semester should be pass/fail for all students in good standing. But the kind of Mini-Courses in which the senior men would be involved might best be of their own devising; they know best (or should, if their college work has succeeded) the kind of study they need. Seniors themselves should therefore take the initiative in organizing this part of a program for study, seeking out members of the faculty who can serve and guide them. The programs should be structured under the auspices of the department in which the student majors and the School in which that department generally operates.

While there should be as much faculty involvement as possible, especially informal involvement, senior students should also be thinking more and more of teaching themselves and each other. An educated man is one who can transfer his awareness and his understanding to others, can use his skills in some larger social context. One truly knows when he is able to interpret what he knows to others. Thus a true college would be a community of scholars and a community of teachers, with all of us, faculty and students, operating as both.

For this reason seniors during their Exploratory Semester would make an effort to teach one another, to share what they had learned, to take advantage of the skills, information, and understanding not only of their official teachers but also of their fellows. All such Mini-Courses would be certified by the department and the School and would carry credit but no grades. Such certification is frankly designed to assure some faculty involvement and to indicate that the ventures are academically worthwhile, which is a faculty responsibility.

It would also be possible for a department or a School to offer such senior courses for its students. Some Senior Exploratory work might in fact take the form of special semester-long seminars or courses rather than a series of Mini-Courses. What is important is that the work done here be seen as serving the needs of the student in rounding out or filling in, in relating work done in the past or seeing how it all can be applied to the future. The possibilities here are great; the work devised must fit felt intellectual needs and help in the transition from college to the future. One personal stricture: No student should leave Rutgers College without having faced seriously the question of how his proposed profession or occupation or study relates to the larger world around him. He must think this question through for himself, either in a Mini-Course or by other means of his own devising. Let this be still one other hallmark of a Rutgers College man.

RECOMMENDATION:
GENERAL EDUCATION AND DISTRIBUTION REQUIREMENTS

> Education is thought about and as it is thought about it is being done. It is being done in the way it is thought about, which is not true of almost anything. Almost anything is not done in the way it is thought about but education is. It is done in the way it is thought about and that is the reason so much of it is done in New England and Switzerland. There is an extraordinary amount of it done in New England and Switzerland.
>
> In New England they have done it they do it they will do it in every way in which education can be thought about.
>
> I find education everywhere and in New England it is everywhere, it is thought about everywhere in America but only in New England is it done as much as it is thought about. And that is saying a very great deal. They do it so much in New England that they even do it more than it is thought about.

The purpose of this report is simple: I should like to add the state of New Jersey to Miss Gertrude Stein's 1937 characterization of education. This means two things: (1) there must be continuous faculty involvement in and discussion of the whole process of education in the college; the college itself must be defined by this on-going discussion and involvement; (2) since our main task in the college is the education of undergraduates, they too must be thinking about their education.

Put into more routine language, this means that the education of an undergraduate must be an education in awareness; he must be made as fully aware as possible of what exists and goes on in the world and of the ways by which such awareness can be made useful to him and to others. But above all he must be aware of the process by which he is made aware. Every Rutgers College student should play the fullest and most self-conscious role possible in his own education. The obligations he assumes, the courses he elects, the work he does must always impel him to ask and attempt to answer why he is doing what it is he is doing. And he must try to see his education as a whole, how various courses and fields of inquiry relate not only to each other but to his own interests, needs, and concerns. What use he makes of what he learns is in a sense personal; but he must always be an active seeker for his own education and never a passive receiver of what is offered.

Therefore, I recommend that the college abolish the so-called General Education Distribution Requirements with the exception of one semester of Freshman English Composition.

This is the most extreme of these proposals. Let it be understood that it does not contradict the principle that all students ought to have some wider distribution of work in the sciences, the social sciences, and the humanities. And I would advise any student who came to me for such advice to assure himself of work in those areas. But there are reasons, however, why this end should not be sought by the means of rigid requirements.

1. No one can effectively demonstrate that a wide range of courses is indispensable to a liberally educated man. Among other things, such a view assumes that knowledge and understanding come only from classroom work.

2. There is significant educational testing evidence to indicate that sitting through a course, even doing well in a course, assure little retention of content, form, or values from the course unless the student's motivation is high and sustained by more than a desire for good grades.

3. Who can say how many courses or credits or years are necessary to achieve the ends intended by the college when it adopted its current requirements? Some students may gain more from a single semester than others learn in four semesters in the field.

4. The improvements in the high school and the changes in preparation suggest that what might have appeared necessary almost a quarter of a century ago is no longer essential.

5. Our current system of general education requirements is so vague in its designation of courses within categories that it is dubious whether all the courses listed as acceptable under any particular rubric provide anything like a similar experience. Intellectually, the current requirement perpetrates a fraud on students by allowing them to assume a kind of substantive equality which does not exist: to call both physics and geography "sciences" is not to teach our students much about either. Both are eminently respectable and important disciplines but the sense in which they are both sciences is, I submit, much too vague to serve college students well. Further, our current system does not allow for any difference in background, training, or interest in individual students. If there are different interests and needs, the current policy fails to recognize them. It forces, moreover, students to take an intolerable number of introductory courses and limits his possibility of taking additional advanced work in a single discipline. (It would be difficult, for example, for an English major who had sufficient interest to want to take an advanced course in physics to do so; he obviously

could take this as an elective but not in place of another science course, for instance. If a Biological Science major became interested in Art History he would have an even more difficult time in taking anything beyond the introductory course.)

6. But more important than any of these reasons, students should be encouraged to make up their own minds and decide on their own programs; they should do so after proper discussion and advising. The following comment by a student, quoted in Mr. Michael Klein's revealing "Report on the Biological Science Majors' Survey," expresses a typical reaction and while it is specifically directed toward requirements in that major, it is applicable to the subject under discussion as well:

> The choices of Biological Science courses should be left to the student and adviser... Required courses...do not create an interest...they are merely requirements -- and thus do not receive the proper respect.

After talking with over 1000 students I am firmly convinced that almost all students in the college would in fact elect a program with significant over-all distribution. Further, students might be encouraged to follow a pattern of selection that was more thoughtful and intelligent than that forced upon them now by the current requirements: fewer introductory courses, more advanced work by taking several courses in a discipline, courses in the various areas that mean something to a particular student in terms of his interests and needs, in terms of the structure of his total academic program.

The choice of particular courses ought to make sense not simply as satisfaction of a requirement. The decision of a student to elect a particular program should not come without considerable thought and discussion, a necessary part of the educational process. The idea of requirements eliminates the need for either thought or discussion. If we cannot demonstrate the value of particular work in free discourse with our students, we certainly cannot be sure of accomplishing more by requiring courses.

Such a change might have a healthy effect on the college in other ways. Introductory courses which now face limited competition for students because many students are virtually required to take them might well have to improve in order to maintain student interest. There is little doubt that various departments do consider their basic courses primarily as enrollment management devices. There is nothing wrong with this procedure except if it fails to do a good job for the undergraduate student. But this is happening more and more frequently (and it is one of the many important lessons that can be learned from the excellent Course and Teacher

Evaluation booklet provided last Spring by the Student Council). It is about time there was more competition between courses and less between students. With as good a student body as we have, courses ought to be able to stand on their own intrinsic worth. We do not need to use our introductory courses for enrollment management at this stage of the college's development. At one time it was necessary and proper to use the Humanities requirement and examination to build up work in Music and Art History; today both departments are highly regarded by students and will continue to draw even if the distribution requirement disappears.

A change in the system might also encourage departments to think about more one semester introductory courses. It might lower the enrollment in such "baby" courses (the local idiom is especially revealing) but increase the interest in various advanced courses in the same department, providing for a more balanced overall departmental load.

In any case, the fundamental argument rests on a view of program-making as a key student responsibility. The student must be free even to make mistakes; we cannot force him to be liberally educated. More important than this, if we are indeed concerned that our scientists are not getting enough work in the humanities or our social scientists do not understand sufficiently the nature of scientific inquiry, we may be impelled to devise new programs, not simply new courses or requirements, involving the larger academic environment. Everything does not have to be done in the classroom; everything does not have to be done in a course (an awful lot of interesting and important things are not).

Strangely, students and faculty seem to agree fundamentally about the importance of courses. Neither of them sees the possibility of meaningful educational experience outside the classroom,without grade or credit. Students, always free to organize their own courses and even free to get faculty to help seem willing to do so only when they get academic credit for it. Since we have all succumbed to the mystique of credits, hours, and grades, nobody seems to believe it is possible that learning can take place without them. Students, enjoying a new experience, immediately want academic credit for having undergone it. One can imagine the students reinstated at Columbia deciding that their revolution was a most profound political experience from which they had learned a good deal, and demanding that the faculty give three hours of academic credit for it!

The time has come to admit that there is no sequence of courses, no individual course that can be designated as essential in the process of a liberal education; obviously there are some courses more nearly so than others. Of course our students should take work in a variety of fields, especially when their background and training show them to have limited awareness in some of these areas. But we must show them why and persuade them; to require is possibly to use the means that destroys the ends.

This proposal to end the current system of distribution requirements is radical only insofar as it calls for a change in means; it does not quarrel with the announced ends of the existing system. Students should develop an awareness of the phenomena and experiences dealt with, the methods of analysis characteristic of the disciplines in the traditional three major fields. And while the recommendation of this report puts the burden of program making on the individual student, it in no sense relieves the faculty of its responsibility in this matter. In fact, it increases such responsibility by stressing more than before the importance of advising itself as an aspect of the teaching process. Further, the faculty ought to provide for all students some guidelines for program making. Such guidelines should be flexible rather than rigidly fixed but they ought to offer some assurance against too much specialization.

I therefore recommend the following guidelines: (1) a major field or program should contain no more than eight to ten semester courses in a single subject (including introductory level courses in the field). This would, in effect, leave the number of courses in the major unchanged from the current system but would mean, because of the overall reduction in total number of courses required, that the major would occupy a more significant place in the student's program (roughly, between one-quarter and one-third). (2) In developing a carefully balanced program, a student might be expected to take further work, perhaps eight to ten semester courses, in related disciplines found in the same School from which he has elected his major. (3) The college might then assume that the student would divide a significant part of the courses remaining, ten to twelve semester courses (or roughly, one-third of his total course work) rather equally among courses in departments found in Schools other than his own. The Sociology major, for example, would select these courses from departments in the School of Humanistic Studies, the School of Scientific Studies, and the School of Applied Scientific Studies.

At the same time the faculty lays down such guidelines it ought also to indicate a proper division between 100-200 level courses and 300-400 level courses in a normal student program. Something must be done so that students are encouraged not to limit their selection of courses outside the major field to introductor or "baby" courses. I would recommend that one-half of the student's work be in courses of the 300-400 level.

What about foreign languages? Obviously, the new program would put an end to the current foreign language requirement. There has, in fact, been a growing realization in quality institutions throughout the country that the required foreign language is no longer meaningful as a requirement.

1. Our students enter with unprecedented foreign language preparation. Yet the current requirement is maintained. More and more of our students have had at least three years of a single foreign language. If we are concerned about the value of foreign language training let us insist that all students do have at least three years of a single language on admission. Such an entrance requirement now becomes practical if the faculty wishes to make this change.

2. Serious study has challenged the claims of those who would keep a foreign language requirement for a liberal arts curriculum. The following summary statement* is based on such studies and is confirmed by my own more impressionistic study of the situation at Rutgers College:

> In the American college foreign languages constitute one of five or six major segments of the curriculum. What are the goals in the teaching of foreign languages? No generally agreed upon answer exists to that question, and its very pursuit, when it occurs, is frequently lacking in vigor and extent. In what follows we attempt to state a variety of possible goals of language teaching in college, mentioning difficulties as we go along...
>
> (1) The most obvious goal is that of equipping the student with sufficient knowledge of the language so that he has access to the literature and the people of the foreign country. But this goal is only a paper goal and if the teaching of languages had to be evaluated in regard to it, only a very small percentage of all language teaching would meet it. (2) The study of a foreign language is to equip one with a sense of the structure of language, leading among other things to a better appreciation of one's native tongue. But when this is said, it is left untested whether this goal is best, or even adequately, reached by present language teaching. Conceivably comparative linguistic courses might fulfill this function much better. (3) The study of a foreign language is a prime tool for acquainting the student with a foreign culture. It is also a prime device for making him hate French or Spanish, or for leaving him indifferent. To be

---

*Joseph Katz and Levitt Sanford, "The Curriculum in the Perspective of the Theory of Personality Development," in Levitt Sanford, Editor, The American College (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Science Editions, 1967) pp. 437-439.

frustrated in regard to the language of a culture, as students so often are, is hardly likely to contribute to international amity. (4) The study of foreign languages is antiethnocentric. But the experience of the German secondary school system alone, with its heavy emphasis on foreign languages, provides evidence that this need not be so. There may indeed be antiethnocentric uses to which the study of language can be put, but they do not reside in the teaching of foreign languages as such. In some students one can even note a re-enforcement of ethnocentrism by way of language learning. These are the students upon whom the foreign language courses have made an impact and who have become chauvinistic in the language and culture of their choice; in other words, their native chauvinism has remained intact, but has now become somewhat less accessible to insight because of the pseudo-cosmopolitan overlay. (5) The study of language can be viewed pragmatically in that it gives a skill usable for employment in business, government, research organizations, and the like. Russian seems currently to enjoy such a utilitarian vogue. But this goal eliminates language as a liberal subject.

There are three further pragmatic uses of language: (6) Some languages are required for entrance and exit requirements in college and for obtaining of the Ph.D. degree, and in this context they are a well-known unfunctional hurdle. This use of language is of course nonliberal, too, and these requirements stem from the eternal logic, or illogic, of the university system, with little relation to the purposes of education. (7) The study of foreign language is good discipline for the mind. This is an almost frankly psychological goal, but it should be subjected to the legitimate psychological tests. Does the study of foreign languages instill discipline or obedience? Can one speak of discipline as desirable without regard to objectives that are meaningful to the student and that allow him a sufficient sense of accomplishment? (8) Some particular languages are considered to furnish a good basis for the learning of other languages. Thus Latin is recommended as a good base for learning modern romance languages. That may well be, but here our goals are becoming circular.

(9) The study of language can be viewed with certain leisure goals in mind. The most obvious one is the acquisition of a minimum of knowledge, enough to ease foreign travel and conversation with foreigners in one's own country. Sometimes superficial knowledge of a language gives one a minimum of social savoir-faire, from reading a menu in a restaurant to establishing one's respectability by being able to recite in like

> company some detached lines of a classic. Such uses, although undoubtedly pleasant at times, again raise the question as to whether they are genuinely liberal.
>
> The question may be raised whether college is the appropriate time or appropriate place for the learning of languages. In regard to time, we have some evidence that the optimal age for language learning comes much earlier than the college years. In regard to place, it might be asked whether the learning of language belongs in the college curriculum at all, or rather should be considered a prerequisite to it. Students might not be admitted to the foreign literature courses until they know the language. This would free foreign language teachers for the teaching they are interested in and prepared for. Teaching machines may soon free the language teacher from the elementary tasks anyway.

In case anyone should think it unfair of me to cite this particular analysis of foreign languages, let me quote also the passage that immediately follows in the report:

> Our analysis of goals in foreign language teaching can be duplicated for every other subject in the curriculum. Discrepancy between professed goals and actual achievement is a general phenomenon and foreign languages, like mathematics, have the advantage of having the outcome more measurable, while in other fields memorization, cramming, and other devices make measurement more difficult.

It is precisely for this reason that I have raised serious doubts that there is any essential subject for the liberal arts student, any courses or even kinds of courses he must have to be considered liberally educated.

3. In few cases can it be demonstrated that students develop sufficient facility with the foreign language studies to make any effective use of it. I know of no course outside of the language departments themselves which require students to use the language the college has required that he study; this is a scandal. The college opens itself up to serious challenge: Does it really mean what it says? If it seriously believes in the value of language study why does it not insist that it be made a working part of a student's education? Why are there not courses in other disciplines conducted in the language or at least requiring extensive reading in the language? Are we busy finding chores for our students or attempting to build a good and large staff in foreign languages by engaging in enrollment management to assure an effective graduate program, or do we really believe in the liberal value of such study?

This is anything but an argument against mastering language skills. Any student who comes with three or four years of foreign language study in high school and does not take additional work in literature or in some area where he can develop his ability to use the language is making a serious error. All students who propose even to consider doing graduate work must be told at the outset that it normally includes the ability to use foreign languages. But this does not mean we must continue a requirement that is rarely functional.

The learning of foreign languages as a required subject in a college curriculum no longer has a place, especially with students who offer three or more years of a language on entrance. This means that language departments must do everything possible to make their programs more attractive. It will come as no secret that the most serious criticism of all teaching done in the college is reserved for languages and mathematics. In both cases it may be that captive audiences have created in too many instructors sloth, although not in all. There are some brilliant teachers. But the time has come when the languages must revitalize their programs to attract students on the basis, not of a requirement, but of free competition with other areas in the college.

There are several things that might be done: special recruitment of students from the high schools with special language gifts and interests would be in line with the ideas advanced for the School scheme; organization of dormitory sections in the various languages beginning with the Freshman year; the development with faculty members in other departments of programs in which the use of the foreign language becomes the central tool. What about a major in Italian where the student gets an opportunity to develop his fullest command of the language because he is using it not only in his language classes but in classes in art, music, history, etc.? What about the various area studies programs conducting their integrative seminars in the language of the area? Why not assign foreign language teachers to departments and courses other than language and literature where they might be able to help integrate some foreign language work into these courses, much like the proposal I made earlier about the use of English instructors in such courses? The Junior Year Abroad program will certainly continue to serve as a stimulus to the relevant foreign languages. But this idea could be extended. Is it not possible to develop at home an education that was truly bilingual? Couldn't students at Rutgers College take a variety of courses all of which were in a foreign language (special courses or special sections of existing courses)?

The current requirement, the quality of teaching, the fact that it takes such a long time for a student attempting to learn a language afresh, the additional fact that the current system forces a student to undertake the study of a language before he has any sense of his particular need for a language, all this has led to a severe decline of interest in the study of languages precisely at the time when such study might be regarded as more valuable. A good deal might be gained if at least the first two years of language work were regarded as the acquisition of basic skills and not as a liberal arts subject. It might lead to rethinking the way such language skills ought to be taught. In a later section of this report I shall return again to this problem because I believe in the value of language skills and wish to see them more widely encouraged on this campus. But the evidence is overwhelming that a system of requirements is an improper means to this end.

In urging the college to take a whole new look at our system of distribution requirements, this report obviously leaves open the possibility that any major department may require of its own major students any work or proficiency it deems necessary in undertaking a satisfactory major program.

To sum up, our students come to us better trained and prepared than formerly; they have individual needs and interests, varied educational and cultural backgrounds, and must be encouraged to build for themsleves meaningful total programs; the mature Rutgers College no longer has need for a system of requirements for proper enrollment management; there are reasons to believe that our students will take the job of self-education seriously enough to follow advice after discussion and make a wise choice of courses, including some significant distribution among the various traditional fields. But most important of all, the idea of individual responsibility for program making, aided by a new accent on advising and a system of faculty guidelines, can -- even for Freshmen -- make a significant contribution toward the goal of a liberal education.

RECOMMENDATION:
PHYSICAL EDUCATION

Mr. Albert Twitchell, our Director of Athletics, in a recent communication to the Provost, recommended a change from a required to a voluntary program in Physical Education.* He suggests "that a proper program would offer Physical Education to a student for four years as an elective, the amount of credit to be determined by the faculties involved."

> Basically each course would cover specific areas of individual and combative sports. For example: handball and squash, tennis and badminton, basketball and volleyball, isotonic and isometric exercise, golf,etc.
>
> A course description would include the history, the rules, the techniques and skills, and the application through participation.

This is the best and the most intelligent approach to the whole question of Physical Education offered at any institution with which I am familiar. It provides precisely what students need and want, with an effective balance of necessary exercise and discipline and the kind of training and practice valuable for post-college life. The results of an excellent Student Council Committee report would seem to be in line with this proposal. That report also raised some significant questions about the ready availability of equipment and instruction for all students in the college and I would expect that this matter would be dealt with by the college Athletics Program Committee.

While I recommend Mr. Twitchell's proposal to the faculty, I differ with him on the matter of credit. The college should not make it a practice to give academic credit for any subject, valuable as it may be, that can be regarded basically as the learning of skills. Skills are vital and significant; they are necessary adjuncts to any education. But there are a great many subjects of value that ought to be elected by students for their own sake and not simply to gain additional credit. The game of adding up credits and hours must cease if we are to have truly liberal education.

---

*The original section on this subject had to be rewritten as the result of Mr. Twitchell's proposal. My original version seemed silly. It was based primarily on a most effective Student Council Committee Report and my own predispositions. I found myself rather indignant that we seemed less concerned with students'souls than with their bodies since we long ago gave up compulsory chapel and yet insisted on keeping required physical education.

RECOMMENDATION: THE MAJOR PROGRAM

I strongly recommend that the current program which requires an undergraduate to elect a major field be retained.

It may seem strange that there should be any question of this but the question has been raised, not only by our students but by students and educators throughout the nation. In a poll undertaken by our Student Council (to which a surprisingly high percentage of students responded) 45% of the students indicated they would prefer to have no major field.

I think there is a good reason for this attitude. As departments have become more specialized they have forgotten their function in general education; their eyes have turned increasingly to the graduate school and increasingly, therefore, they have made every effort to make their undergraduate programs professional, to make their majors small model versions of what graduate or professional schools might be like. Some of these developments have been good but often in the process certain key values have been lost.

A departmental major designed to contribute to general education does not have to be unprofessional. What is essential is that the Department owes it to its students to stress and to explain what its value as a major is and why, indeed, we have majors in college. We must--to put it bluntly--justify the major. I do not mean anything quite as silly as the justification for Latin which says, "the study of Latin helps you think logically." Rather, some closer analysis of a particular major is required in terms of the unique or special kind of awareness and understanding it provides, the special role it can play in dealing with a set of phenomena or experiences, its modes of analysis, the kind of symbols and language it uses and how it manipulates them. Often, some insight into the history of the discipline is especially illuminating.

The idea of the discipline-centered major is often wrongly rejected by those who advocate a complete shift to problem-centered programs. They forget that every discipline is itself problem-centered; each arose and developed as it sought answers to problems, and the disciplines in fact became differentiated just because they found themselves dealing with different problems, different experiences, different ways of being aware. Further, it is absurd to argue that disciplines are of necessity narrow. Today almost every discipline requires a breadth in its practitioners previously unheard of. With

γ

increased specialization has come a certain narrowing but also it has often demanded the learning of a wider variety of skills and approaches. Any department might be expected to present a structured series of requirements for its majors in an effort to reveal the nature and purposes of the discipline most fully. But it must do so in ways which frankly do educate the student so that he understands why, so that the major as a way of understanding the world is made fully clear to him as a model of a discipline revealing its usefulness.

This report proposes no additional departmental majors although it does recommend that every year the Course of Study Committee carefully investigate new departmental majors and other major programs introduced at any of the other New Brunswick colleges in an effort to see whether such majors ought also to be added to our basic offerings. Currently, for example, the proposed programs of study at Livingston College indicate possible majors in the following fields that the Course of Study Committee might want in due course to recommend for Rutgers College as well: Anthropology, Chinese, Comparative Literature, Computer Science, Linguistics.

In keeping with the fundamental assumption behind this report, the need for fullest flexibility and the recognition of a wide variety of needs and interests among students, I continue to support the idea of interdisciplinary major programs. We have several such programs currently and in another section of this report there will be proposals for adding to that list of programs. In all such cases, however, programs are based on courses offered within departments with some possible additional integrative interdisciplinary courses.

This report also supports two other possibilities for the major. (1) The recommendation on the establishment of Schools leaves the way open for the various Schools to propose to the college faculty a major program that might be School-centered rather than department-centered. Such a proposal would, of course, be the occasion of full faculty debate and no such major (say a major in the Humanities, or the Social Studies, or the Scientific Studies) could exist without such faculty approval. (2) The recommendations on a Council for Educational Development might permit an undergraduate to develop for himself a program of study individually tailored to meet his needs and interests. If he could convince the Council of the value of such a program, it would then undertake to serve as his sponsor for the degree on the basis of his self-defined program. A major-for-one thus becomes a possibility for a limited number of students.

The bulk of the proposals made in this section of the report are designed to strengthen the major and make it play a more fundamental role in the education of upperclassmen in Rutgers College than the major currently plays.

1. Any department that does not provide an opportunity for the student "to do" rather than simply "to take" fails as a part of a liberal education. Every department owes it to all its majors (and not merely its honors' candidates) to provide them with such an opportunity to engage in the actual enterprise of major field in such a way that some genuine understanding emerges of the major as a vital part of the student's education. This is all the more important as many upperclass courses become as large as introductory courses. Especially in his major field every student should have the opportunity to work closely with a practicing professional in an apprenticeship program, a program of independent study, small seminar-like courses, etc. I recommend that such schemes be arranged by every major department even if this means it will be forced to drop some of its usual formal courses. The History department is currently reworking its program so that every major will be able to take a small-group Junior Seminar. It will mean a serious reduction in the number of usual upperclass courses the department can offer. Other departments have likewise been experimenting along such lines.

It would be most helpful to all departments if they reported annually to the Dean such changes in policy and program and experiments undertaken to revitalize the major. He could then transmit this information to the college as a whole.

2. Instead of student organization in terms of "classes," it is suggested in this report that organizations more closely attuned to academic and educational objectives might be more effective. For the underclassmen the report has recommended the School scheme; for the upperclassmen I propose a mere effective organization in terms of the major. All students majoring in a department or program should constitute a working part of that department or program. Students should be invited to serve on departmental committees, should be involved in efforts to revise major programs, in the process of proposing new courses or altering old ones, and even in providing advice about promotions and new appointments. Full responsibility and final authority would of course remain in the faculty.

To achieve these ends and many others, I propose the following scheme of student organization within every department and program. It is borrowed heavily from a program proposed at another major institution and adapted to our needs:

The core of the proposal is the creation, within each department, of several small advising "sections."

Ideally, the sections should consist of one professor, ten juniors and ten seniors, although fifteen juniors and fifteen seniors is probably more realistic for some departments. (For example, in a department with 200 undergraduate majors and 20 instructors, there would probably have to be six major advisers at any one time.) Entering junior majors would be assigned to their section at the end of the sophomore or the beginning of the junior year. The entering students would submit a list of problems or areas within the major which are of particular interest to him. Those who are especially interested, for example, in secondary school teaching or some other professional option as well as those with particular academic interests might be enrolled in the same sections. Wherever possible, the department would assign the applicant to a section led by a professor who shares one of the students' interest areas. Thus to the degree possible, the members of each section would be united by at least some common emphasis within the major. The fact that the correspondence of emphasis is not likely to work out very neatly (since many students are still unsure of their major interests at this stage) is not a serious drawback, since a certain amount of cross-fertilization and variety is also worthwhile.

Once formed, the section would become a semi-official unit of the department, with allowances, of course, for some fluidity and turnover. The section would meet with its adviser at least once each semester for a joint discussion of the planning and progress of the major programs of its individual members, and at least once at the end of each year for an evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of the departmental program of the previous semesters in the light of the experience of the section members.

The aim of the quarterly meeting would be to assist the students in the planning and implementation of a rational and coherent major program (i.e., the traditional advising function) in a setting which encourages the students to share their ideas and problems both with their colleagues and their major adviser. In many cases these sessions should obviate the necessity of individual visits to the adviser for the signing of study lists (although in some cases individual visits will also be required), thus avoiding needless repetition. In the group setting, the planning of common programs among small groups of students with common interests, under the guidance of a single faculty member, would be encouraged. Such programs could serve as a positive force against the intellectual atomization of the non-professional student body.

The aim of the annual meeting, in addition to the planning of the following year's programs in the case of juniors, would be the development of suggestions for the improvement of existing departmental programs. In addition, such sessions might germinate small-group "courses" as well as interesting course proposals.

An auxilliary function of the advising sections is to assist new majors in accomodating rapidly to their new departments by putting them into immediate contact with seniors who share similar interests. Finally, although I am aware that scarcity of resources will make implementation of this part of the plan difficult, it is my hope that some of the more successful sections could engage in voluntary activities of an intellectual and social nature that would prove to be a useful supplement to the students' formal program, while contributing some real intellectual content to the advising system itself. These activities might include special section meetings to hear occasional papers by the professor, one of the students, another member of the department (including, in particular, graduate students who are working on theses in areas related to the group's special interests) or outsiders. In the interest of both economy and the cross-fertilization of ideas, such meetings might be held jointly by two or more sections with different but related orientations, or even by two sections from different departments. They might also include, where appropriate and feasible, field trips, visits to cultural events, and even informal "bull-sessions" in the apartments of members. Small financial subsidies from the department would of course encourage such projects.

To provide a rational basis for student participation in deliberations on departmental policies, departmental student organizations would be created based on these advising sections. At the end of each academic year, each section--using whatever selection procedures it agreed on--would select a high junior to be its departmental representative for the following year (his senior year). Since the members of each section would have been in close contact for at least two terms, it is likely that their choice would reflect the abilities and commitment of the student chosen. The quality of representatives should be much higher and more relevant to the department's academic needs than the quality yielded by a single department-wide election.

The several students thus elected would constitute a departmental Council of Majors. Each representative would continue to be in close and frequent contact with his section throughout his tenure on the Council, thus ensuring responsiveness to the ideas and problems of his colleagues.

The primary purpose of the Council of Majors would be to serve as a mechanism, along with the department's graduate student organization, for working with the faculty in establishing the regular channels of participation and for assuring that the ideas and proposals emanating from the individual sections are adequately communicated to the department. Undergraduate student representatives for the various departmental committees would be chosen by this group. If student representation on regular departmental committees has not yet been provided for, the Council would select members for the department's Student-Faculty Relations Committee. Finally, it would coordinate activities among the various sections as desired.

This organization of students is not designed in response to cries for "student power" or similar sloganeering. Rather, it is proposed principally for its educational consequences for students. Advising must be considered as part of teaching; involvement in the life of the department as a further way of learning about the discipline. If we are to have a slogan let it be "college power" for it is only when all groups work together that we can achieve the ends we all seek. Already intelligent student effort like the Course and Teacher Evaluation booklet have had an inpact on some departments and some courses, implementing in one case at least the work being done within a department in an effort to revise an introductory course widely held to be unsatisfactory. It is of ever-riding importance that we treat students as part of the major department, not simply as clients but as fellows. It is of great significance to them and to the college as a whole that they be used to help advise and even teach younger students in the Schools.

3. Departmental advising, even under the new proposal, will not succeed unless it assumes greater responsibility for counselling students about the whole of their programs.

a. One example is in the area of training students who propose to enter secondary school teaching. The college has shamefully avoided its responsibilities in this field. Every department that has such students ought to arrange special advising sections for them and participate in whatever special teacher-training programs are available. This means that one member of the department must become familiar with what is going on in the high schools. This is important, not only for the training of new teachers, but also for the adjustment of existing college-level programs in terms of such new developments. The adviser responsible for the section of majors planning on such a career in the schools ought also to serve in a more effective way as a liaison not only with the secondary schools but also with the Graduate School of Education. Current arrangements in the college for handling potential teachers are simply inadequate.

b. It is important that every major be considered in terms of a wider context. I here propose that each student must regard one of the Schools as the general area from which he plans to develop a meaningful context for his major studies. As noted in a previous section, I recommend that the major ought to be defined as approximately one-quarter of the student's undergraduate course work (eight term courses of upperclass work). I propose further that all students be encouraged to take additional work offered in departments in the School in which he elects to work. This suggests that proper understanding of the major field might be best developed in a wider context of sister disciplines. Students should be encouraged to think in terms of this kind of context and of the value of certain relationships between disciplines. The choice of that context should in all cases be the student's. This view of the central role of the major in selecting a total program for the last two years is designed to stress individual interests and individual program development. For example, one man's interest in history might be very different from another's; one might approach his discipline as one of the Humanities; another as one of the Social Studies; a philosophy major might see his interests in reference to Scientific Studies while another as part of the Humanities. It is suggested that a student therefore might take between eight and ten semester courses in various departments in the same School as his major.

The proposals here make no special allowances for a program, for example, in biological sciences. I believe it is perfectly possible to organize an effective program in biological sciences within the general rubric outlined here. Under any reading of the current program, it appears excessive; it goes far beyond the minimum requirements for medical school admissions and far beyond their needs as student majors and recent graduates of the program in medical schools see them. A most interesting report based on a survey of the majors in the current program and prepared by a sub-committee of the Student Council suggests just how fundamentally illiberal the current program is. The majority of students seem to take no intellectual satisfaction in the work they are doing; they can discover in fact little intellectual justification for the program. They admit that they remain in the program because they believe that it provides the best assurance of medical school acceptance. Further, they make perfectly clear that they have little idea why they are asked to take the subjects they do take.

If we propose truly to be a liberal arts college then the time has come to insist that our probrams be in some sense truly liberal and truly liberating. Interestingly enough, the biological sciences majors surveyed in the report cited above indicated that the basic course in art history many of them take was second only to the basic biology course as of "most significant value." The plan proposed in this report would still provide an opportunity for considerable work in the sciences, certainly more than sufficient for effective specialization. The Association of the American Medical Colleges recommends as a minimum (roughly) nine semester courses (really 28 hours of work in science. The program herein proposed would allow between 16 and 20 semester courses.

c. The selection of courses outside the School should also be done as the result of consultation and discussion. There should always be an effort on the part of the student to rationalize his selection of courses, to seeing his whole program in terms of the kind of education he is seeking for himself. Some effort should be made to avoid the cafeteria approach; every effort should be made to see significant relationships. In no sense, however, does the general program proposed here eliminate the possibility of such student sampling if he so desires. Freedom and flexibility remain the key words. But the opportunity for genuine discussion, with faculty and fellow students, in advising sections would give every student an opportunity to investigate and debate possible alternatives.

4. The nature of the particular requirements of the major field itself is obviously a function of the department itself; it is responsible for its own requirements and is free to insist as well on additional required courses outside the department that it believes important in preparing the major. Such work at all times required by any department, however, is expected to remain within the flexible guidelines provided by the college. Hopefully, departmental requirements will be discussed frequently with the majors and reviewed by the whole department. There ought to be continuous conversation on the why's and wherefore's of departmental programs; students are entitled to know why the faculty has arranged this particular set of requirements and ought to be free to challenge them in discussion. The special nature and function of the major requires that it provide, on occasion, a more highly structured and more tightly disciplined approach. Students will of course be aware of this when selecting a major field. A few suggestions for the departments do seem in order:

a. The proliferation of highly specialized courses ought to stop. I have myself in this report argued that majors ought to be provided a special opportunity to do work in the field in a course or some program specifically designed for majors but the overwhelming majority of courses offered in any department must be expected to serve not only majors but any student in the college. That is unfortunately not the case. Too frequently courses are newly added to the undergraduate catalog in particular departments which their sponsors freely admit are designed primarily for graduate students or would-be graduate students. I am not referring only to science departments. This is clearly not a proper use of the right to offer courses, and both departments and college committees involved ought to scrutinize new proposals most specifically in terms of their justification as part of a program for undergraduates. This has not been the case. Coverage as a criterion for course offerings is not sufficient; the function of any college or any education is not simply the presentation of vast bodies of information. There is no proposition more absurd that the often-hears notion that every member of the faculty has the right to teach "his specialty," no matter how narrowly defined. It is true, without question, that every member of the faculty should have some opportunity to use his expertise, his particular skills and methods, his special knowledge in his teaching. This is very different from offering a highly specialized course. Even for the major departments should pay more attention to providing a group of courses that define for the undergraduate the nature of the discipline in its various aspects but offerings should be tailored to undergraduate needs and specific work for graduate students ought to be considered separately.

b. Reduction in overall course load should lead departments to reconsider seriously the nature of the courses offered in an effort to cut back when possible. Departments should consider turning some year-long courses into semester courses. Semester courses are a way of providing a richer and more varied experience, a more flexible kind of program building. They do not have to be more superficial and indeed can have a good deal of depth as well as breadth if the idea of the need to"cover" a field or present vast amounts of date is eliminated. This practice of using semester courses as a basis of program making is already policy in some departments and impressionistic investigation suggests it works very well. With the limitation of course load proposed, this becomes even more important.

RECOMMENDATION: NEW PROGRAMS IN THE COLLEGE

My report not only indicates my view that the individual departments ought to remain a strong and solid core in the college but seeks to make the departmental major, in a sense, even more important in upperclass years. Nevertheless, the college has already committed itself to a series of inter-departmental major programs which might very well be extended. It is important to stress that these programs are inter-departmental. That is, almost all the faculty who teach in a program belong to a department and have their basic responsibilities there; most of the courses taken by students in the program are courses that are also offered for credit in a particular department. These courses are frequently supplemented by some interdisciplinary seminars, the staffing of which is worked out by arrangements among departments. No fundamental alteration of this overall pattern is needed.

No new programs are proposed in any of the area studies because many of these are already underway and obviously new ones are in the developmental stage. Most, in fact, so-called area study work can be undertaken without a special program from a base in a traditional major with careful selection of related work from different disciplines and therefore poses no special problem.

I have, rather, selected five possible new programs that would be of special value. Programs are suggested in rough outline and are based on problems of great significance in our time and underemphasized in our college or the university at large; each might bring together not only members of what used to be Arts and Sciences departments but also might use the talents and skills of faculty in Engineering and possibly Agriculture and Environmental Sciences. If members of these faculties and their students are to be considered part of the college they ought to be a part, intellectually as well as physically. In addition, each of these programs suggests something that might in fact become a "core program" around which a whole college program itself might be developed. Our college might serve a valuable role for the University in experimenting with such programs.

In most instances the programs proposed come from strong expressions of student interest; several were endorsed by faculty colleagues as well. All have at the base the idea that there are currently in the catalog courses and staff experts that might afford at least the basis for beginning such programs. However, in every case new staff and new courses would be necessary to make for a fully effective program. Departments would have to be willing to shift their own new faculty priorities but would undoubtedly be willing to do so since such new personnel and new courses would also strengthen their offerings.

1. Science and Society

Student interest in the sciences and their significance is at an all time high at Rutgers College as well as at other institutions. One of the major objections of students to the current science distribution requirement is that they don't really learn about science; students are fascinated by questions about the philosophy of science, the methodology of science, the history and sociology of science. There is the further factor of professionalization of all our departments of science which makes it very difficult, if not impossible, for a student to study the sciences as cultural subjects. To major in a science is to commit oneself to a highly specialized and very professionalized education from the start. This is not to quarrel with the way science is taught on this campus for those who will indeed become the necessary professionals of the future. Rather, I ask that some alternative be provided for many others. Indeed, there are those who believe that such options ought also to be open to those who will become scientists as well. Let me quote a scientist who does complain, Prof. Bentley Glass*:

> Our college training in the sciences tends to be far too narrow and too specialized. It turns out technicians of extremely circumscribed vision... In teaching science we must not forget, in other words, that it is simultaneously a social study and a creative art, a history of ideas, a philosophy, and a supreme product of esthetic ingenuity. The graduate who has missed this experience, whether science major or non-major, has missed the basis for a rational judgment of today's critical problems. He has likewise lost a revelation deep in meaning and of unending beauty.

I doubt very much that, for example, the vast majority of biological science graduates gain from their experience at Rutgers College the objectives that this biologist proposes. It may in fact very well be the case that the rigors of scientific training more and more preclude such grand visions. It is not likely that any judgment of mine (most especially since I am no scientist) or even of the college as a whole could move the various departments in question to alter significantly the programs they believe essential for their own majors. But we do have a right, as a college, to ask that some program be offered to those interested in the sciences but unwilling to become the kind of professional required by our current programs. We need people in business, in public life, teachers of science in the schools, informed citizens with awareness and understanding of science and its relationships to the wider world. We need courses and even a program of courses available to scientists and non-scientists which put the study of science in a wider setting.

---

*Science and Liberal Education (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1959) p. 63.

Thus I am proposing the development of a program in Science and Society as the highest priority for the college. In such a program new courses might very well develop which might be interdisciplinary or inter-departmental, but at the outset it would be possible to build a special program out of relatively standard courses and existing special fields: basic courses in the sciences and mathematics, work in the philosophy of science; the study of the history of science as well as the sociology and the important politics of science. The whole area of the relationsips that do and have existed between the sciences and the humanities -- literature, art, music -- could provide a basis for sound and substantial academic work. Psychology has light to shed on the process of creative scientific inquiry. If there were not sufficient warrant to be found in a quantity of scholarship of high quality in all of these fields, the popular interest in many of these questions -- witness the debate such writings as the recent work of Arthur Koestler, or Price on _The Scientific Establishment_ and Ralph Lapp in _The New Priesthood_, or Watson's _The Double Helix_ -- argues for serious consideration of these and other questions by college students.

There is a hunger for such a program and the initial means to begin to satisfy such a hunger within this college. We cannot ask the individual departments of science to undertake complete revisions of their programs in ways that would run counter to their views of sound educational procedure, but we can call for their cooperation and that of other elements of the college community to create not only new courses in several departments but to hire new men in related fields who could contribute both to departmental programs and a more general undergraduate program of a cooperative nature. Immediate action on this proposal is desirable not only for those who already have the interest but also for those students majoring in the traditional sciences as auxiliary courses that can supply an effective context for their studies. How much more sensible, for example, for a science student to learn something about the social sciences by taking work in the sociology of science or the politics of science; how much more effective for such a student to see the significance of historical study by taking work in the history of science, for understanding the approach of philosophy by taking work in the philosophy of science.

How long can we afford to overlook this vital area of human concern? Can we feel we do enough by offering the excellent but increasingly highly specialized and professionalized work in the various sciences? Are we doing all we can to meet a variety of interests and needs among our students? Are we, in fact, doing enough for our science majors themselves who will be after all, part of a larger world than the world of science?

Mathematics: A Footnote

Let me digress from a discussion of new programs to call your attention to another problem that is in some sense related to the one discussed above. I start with the expression of a bias: I am convinced that it is growing imperative for all of us to have a more fundamental understanding of the nature and role of mathematics. I have long argued that just as the university became modern when it replaced the central role of classic literature with the study of modern languages, so the contemporary university will come into existence when mathematics replaces modern languages as central in undergraduate education.

Obviously, the way to learn mathematics is by doing mathematics; the same holds true in every field. But there ought to be some course in the college where the basic nature of mathematics could be explored and understood by undergraduates who did not seek or need more advanced, technical knowledge. Such a course might explain what it is mathematics seeks to do and how it does it. It could introduce in elementary form number theory and set theory, an introduction to logical analysis, the basis of computer work and of statistics, the mathematical foundations of cybernetics and systems analysis, game theory, etc. There are obviously a host of issues that could be discussed and that would provide the general student with some basic understanding of what mathematics is and why it has become increasingly important that we understand this particular way of expressing and using certain kinds of relationships.

One of the most interesting suggestions made to me in the course of my investigations was that such a course might very well be taught, not necessarily by the mathematics department, but by individuals in other departments with an interest and ability in mathematics. I have not discussed this idea specifically with anyone in the mathematics department; I trust that my raising the question here in this manner will not seem rude or improper. It seemed to me, however, that such a course might very well find a place in the kind of program discussed above. If the college were in fact interested in such a general course and the department of Mathematics felt little interest in offering it, it would seem to me proper to ask a committee (or the Fellows of the School of Scientific Studies or the staff in the Program in Science and Soceity) to consider the whole question.

2. Environmental Studies

A major shortcoming in the work of the college is its failure to provide a systematic and effective program concerned with the nature and role of man's environment and his relationship to it. We largely pretend that the natural environment in which we live -- to say nothing of the public problems associated with its uses and misuses -- does not exist. One can learn something about it in various work done in the biological sciences and in geography and geology. There is a course offered under the rubric of that home for interdisciplinary courses, Arts and Sciences, to a very limited number of students. The College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences obviously gives relevant courses but these are rarely recommended and rarely taken by our students.

Here, then, is another place where we need a more general and widely publicized program, a major program for students who are, perhaps, most interested in combining scientific and social scientific interests. Obviously, here is an opportunity to use work in sociology as well as geography, geology as well as botany. Ecological studies have significance for political scientists and historians (who have interests in demographic study and have frequently discussed land use, soil depletion, and other ecological issues as major factors in history). Nature, Wilderness, Conservation -- these are all key ideas in history that have had consequences for the history of the mind, for the development of culture, as well as for man's physical and social development. The arts, too, have offered a special vision of man's relationship with his natural environment. There are issues here that are poetic and aesthetic as well as crucial issues in public policy; there are issues that are scientific and technical and others that raise important moral issues as well. The point is that there are few departments that might not have a significant contribution to make in such a program.

What makes it especially important that we try to use the existing resources of the college to put together a series of courses (both existing and newly organized) that represents a more comprehensive analysis of our environment is not simply the new urgency that some of these issues create in public policy today but more practically the partial involvement of the College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences in Rutgers College. Should there not be some program for our undergraduates which allows them to benefit more particularly by that relationship? Further, aren't there equal opportunities for faculty in the college to offer work that would be relevant for students whose primary interests are found in the College of Agriculture? Can we not use the resources of both bodies for the common benefit of all students in the College?

There is much talk of relevance these days. What could be more relevant than a systematic effort to explore environmental problems such as over-population, air pollution, conservation, etc.? The issues are political and scientific, moral and aesthetic, social and cultural. To fail to suggest that an awareness of the environment is profoundly important is to fail as a college; to fail to use this opportunity to show the extraordinary interrelatedness of knowledge and human problems presented by this whole field of inquiry is to fail as educators. What is offered at a college suggests in large part what a college regards as significant and important. The catalog becomes a textbook; it alerts students to various kinds of knowledge, various issues that exist, various methods of handling them. Thus students who do not elect courses in this area or do not undertake to do major work here still learn that there are such problems and there are ways of studying them. They come to know people who are working in the area and learn what some of the facts and issues are. They become aware and we hope even interested enough to allow their awareness to ripen into understanding.

3. Technology and the Social Order

All that I have suggested about the study of science, all that I have referred to in my discussion of Environmental Studies most obviously leads to that other great aspect of our environment of which we cannot (or certainly ought not) be unaware and yet which we rarely study systematically. The role of technology in the modern world is so obvious that I cannot imagine any modern college that does not offer some technological studies -- I mean not simply professional studies for would-be technologists but also studies for those who increasingly must face the problems of living and working in a world in which technology plays a profoundly important role. Yet where are such studies? There is work in some departments that bears directly on this wide area (in sociology and political science, for example) but this is only a tiny beginning. There are, after all, many departments that could make a significant contribution.

History could contribute with an historian of technology (a rich and rapidly developing field of inquiry). I am pleased to report that in the radically revised introductory history course considerable attention is being paid to the role of technology in history (as well as to the role of the environment, I might add). Sociology, political science, geography -- these are obviously interested disciplines that have much to contribute. In recent years there has been a whole series of important studies (many of them especially in what is known as American Studies) that have suggested the impact of technology on the imagination of writers and artists, on poets and architects. Again the pattern holds: many departments might well be able to contribute courses and personnel to such a program. But most important, here we should call on our colleagues in Engineering. We need a course that can describe and analyze the nature of contemporary technology. Work in engineering design is valuable both in understanding the logic of the engineer's approach and the problems involved in the solution of basic design problems (social, physical, personal), the aesthetic and perhaps moral issues that arise. Again, can we propose we are in fact relevant in today's world without suggesting that we all ought to be aware of the technological environment, its causes and consequences? Isn't it significant that an approach like systems analysis, so important in certain areas of engineering, has become increasingly important for the study of the social sciences as well? Where can our students learn about all of this? We are not talking about artificial or contrived relationships between disciplines. We are talking about areas of interaction that do exist, that are operative and significant. Don't we need a wider understanding of the basis of computer technology and the consequences of the whole technological revolution caused by cybernetics and the increased application of computer science? Can the college be satisfied merely to offer more and more specialized work in engineering and computer science? Do not those who will work and live as professionals in these areas also need what they can gain from the study of work in history and the social sciences, from philosophy and the humanities related most specifically to the nature and role of technology?

4. Communications

In important ways, "communications" is an aspect of technological innovation; an interdisciplinary program in Communication Studies might naturally be said to follow from the arguments advanced in the previous section on Technological Studies. But increasingly the whole area has taken on special significance of its own. Nor does this mean we must simply follow a current fad like McLuhanism. For even before we get into this particular area, there is important work on the nature of communication itself done by psychologists and biologists, by engineers and linguists (and certainly it must seem shocking these days when linguistic issues have become so significant that the college offers no linguistics as distinguished from the study of particular languages). "Feedback," to mention only the tritest example, has become a commonplace word and yet it relates to phenomena vital to an understanding of what "communication" is. The whole question of the nature of communications involves men and machines, philosophers and technicians. Thus the whole issue could involve several courses in several disciplines.

Further, there are psychological and sociological issues involved in the causes and consequences of communications systems. We know, for example, that a whole school of sociologists developed a view of social process based on communications models and that some outstanding historians had come to the conclusion that the way people communicated was an historical determinant of major significance. We know that from all of this have arisen serious studies of the consequences of communication that stress political, moral, and aesthetic issues of immediate concern. The college already offers relevant courses in a number of departments and a few under the general category of Arts and Sciences that are among the more popular courses in the college because of the relevance the students find in this study.

The college currently offers work in Journalism. Little of it seems of value to a liberal arts college and its program; much of its work involves the development of special skills and techniques. Yet some of the work it does offer might significantly be placed in an effective context in a major program in communications. Such a program would be directed to a serious study of the nature and consequences of various communications media and not to training people in various communication skills. Thus, such a program as discussed here, might transform an element in the college of limited use today into the very core of a program of immediate relevance and influence on campus.

The college might develop in greater breadth and scope serious studies of various media. The Department of English currently offers initial work in film criticism. Other work on films and other media -- historical, sociological, critical -- should be made available. Basis for additional work in aspects of popular culture exists in some offerings in Journalism and Art History and these could be expanded. We need more work that makes students aware of verbal and non-verbal symbols and the uses to which they are put, how they are manipulated and why. All of this raises, of course, aesthetic, social, political and ultimately moral questions.

It is apparent that in this whole vast area there are possibilities for the creation of a special major program to serve as a miniature core program for some students who have interests in this area, a program that will allow systematic use and integration of work in the sciences, social sciences, and the humanities.

5. Studies in War and Peace

This program results from the extraordinary faculty debate over the R.O.T.C. issue last Spring and the current interest in the studies of the nature of violence. It could not be more relevant, although the program is not proposed as a popular series of discussions of contemporary issues.

If we are going to continue to offer some work in R.O.T.C. and the academic work involved in that program is to be handled by recognized academic departments, why don't we use the opportunity this provides to offer a whole program for an undergraduate major that would stress the issues involved in making and keeping the peace as well as the making of war? Why don't we extend the basic idea involved in the R.O.T.C. reforms to provide a general inter-departmental program that would attract a wide variety of students interested in problems of violence and social order? In keeping with the faculty decision of last Spring, some departments must already anticipate offering new courses or reconstructing existing courses. There was a good deal of impressive talk during our debates about the central experience war has been in civilization; such a program, pooling resources of all who threw light on the nature of violence and human aggression and the role of ideas and institutions in checking its expression would be both fitting and proper. (It is clear that work in R.O.T.C. -- the technical military skills -- could not be a part of such an academic program.)

There is no social science discipline that would not have something to contribute in the way of existing courses or courses that might be developed: anthropology, political science, sociology, economics, history, geography. Current discussions of violence and aggression have also involved psychologists and biologists. In any such program serious attention ought to be given to the role of science and technology too, for not only have wars affected developments in these areas but conditions of war and peace seem significantly related to levels of scientific and technological development.

Further, it would not be possible to leave out of such a program the study of political and social theory; the role of the philosopher and the political scientist too. The new role of game theory, systems analysis, bureaucracy all suggest additional areas of study. The arts, too, could play a part in such a program: writers from Homer to Mailer have reacted to wars and violence in special ways and painters, too, have been known to respond in their own way to the face of war.

To make any of these programs operative several steps are necessary after there is agreement that such programs might be worthwhile. (1) The Dean must appoint a committee from those interested in or anxious to participate in the development of each program. (2) Such a committee should determine which courses already exist of utility to the program and which faculty members are willing to offer related courses. It must make recommendations about additions to the staff necessary to create an effective total program. (3) The Dean should consult with the departments about adding in these areas to their offerings. (4) A list of ordered priorities must be developed in an effort to plan for future operations. Some decision must be made about what programs should be developed and in what order. (5) A beginning might be made in some programs on the basis of current staff and course offerings after approval by proper faculty committees and the faculty. Or the Council on Educational Development (described later) might undertake one or more of these programs on an experimental basis.

In any instance some sources of additional funds to help in the development of these programs should be sought. One or two might be undertaken without additional funding but if there were any desire by the college to undertake all five, it is obvious that some source of additional money would have to be discovered. The committees on each program appointed by the Dean might very well be the source of a program for submittal as a request for such aid.

In summary, the new programs proposed are "relevant" to the contemporary world without in any sense responding only to the immediate, for they are and have been constant human concerns. The new programs do not propose new departments but build on strengthened existing departments, providing therefore new graduate as well as undergraduate work. At the same time the creation of such programs encourages meaningful interaction between scholars in various disciplines. The new programs become a common core for students majoring in them, who would use the information, methods of analysis, ways of understanding from the social sciences, the natural sciences, the humanities, and the applied sciences. One decided advantage of these programs is the opportunity they provide for intellectual exchange across departmental and curricular lines. Finally, the programs are directed to interests already expressed by students and faculty and therefore constitute a reply to felt needs.

RECOMMENDATION: A COUNCIL FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

There is no such thing as an experimental college; there are, however, colleges that engage in educational experimentation. A college by its very nature is an established institution with rules, regulations, and procedures, daily routines and certain set specific objectives and obligations operating and making continual demands. This is one of the reasons so few colleges are ever able to change their natures radically; this is why so many colleges that begin with a spirit that is new and inventive soon settle down and make for themselves a new orthodoxy out of what was originally "an experiment." Bureaucratization, standardization, routinization -- these may not be attractive words but they would appear to be the lesson of life and logic for all large institutions and they represent developments of considerable value as well. Thus it remains difficult to sustain the experimental attitude -- especially when there are a series of immediate tasks that must be done.

Further, genuine experimentation means risk taking; experiments may obviously fail. They require above all careful testing and evaluation. All of this may mean considerable investment of time and money. Thus the experiments that are undertaken must be chosen with care. They must be watched over with diligence. They must be judged. All of this would indicate that there might very well be interesting experiments that a college might like to attempt but might best be tested first by a smaller group, under special circumstances.

One of the basic ideas on which this report is based is that a liberal arts college is in fact largely identified by its never-ending discussion of the nature of its mission and purposes, its methods and its programs. What keeps the college as college -- rather than simply a collection of individual academic departments -- is some general agreement on the part of all elements (students, faculty, and administration) to join together in the ceaseless conversation about education. Yet how is it possible to meet the enormous demands of daily college routine and still engage in that kind of thinking about education and trying new ways and new programs so essential if change is not to overcome and destroy the institution itself?

Certainly it is clear that we cannot go on the way we have here at Rutgers College. A brief look at our recent past shows clearly what I mean. We have had no continuing conversation in this college. Rather, about once each decade the great and total beast, the college, awakens from slumber to talk for a while before settling down to another decade of sleep. In the 1940's we had Prof. J. Milton French's Committee on Educational Policies Report and the discussion that went with it. That report, as you know, was endorsed and even some of its features were implemented (among other things defining our system of distribution requirements which has been left unchanged since 1945). In the 1950's we had the Self-Study Committee and its report which tried, among other things, to rationalize the previous work of the French Committee and provide some common core of "shared experiences." Once again the college was awakened and there was some debate; but that debate failed to move the beast much and few of the committee's recommendations were adopted or implemented. We now have another chance in the 1960's.

We cannot allow something so central to the life of the college die and try to begin it anew another decade hence. Even if all of the other recommendations made in this report were to be adopted and fully implemented, it would still be imperative that the conversation continue.

This is asking an enormous commitment from an already over-burdened faculty. Yet I think few would deny that we need to continue our review, that we need to engage in some experimentation, that we must be constantly open to new ideas and new methods. The University of California's Muscatine Report states the problem clearly:

> Adaptation to changing circumstances of our advanced and complex campus community can no longer be left to our present overworked standing committees supplemented by infrequent special reviews. There must be some facility for both continuing self-study, and continuous trial change. The studies must be sustained rather than spasmodic; the changes must be experimental rather than permanent.

Moreover, we must always be on guard against aimless or wasteful experimentation that may weaken our existing areas of strength; we must also always be ready to eliminate by constant review elements of existing programs which are themselves a source of weakness although once they were vital. We must remain flexible and open to change; we must be in a position at all times to eliminate dry rot. And we must have some means by which we can constantly be stimulated to our conversation about education without having to stop fulfilling our normal duties and responsibilities.

Here my recommendation borrows shamelessly from the Berkeley experience and by all odds the most successful feature of the reforms at that great university undertaken in implementation of the Muscatine Report:

> We believe it is important to establish machinery, not to implement any single curricular change, but to give continuing consideration, encouragement, and financial support to all worthy proposals

> for educational development. Such machinery must combine both an academic and administrative responsibility: on the one hand it must study and plan for improvement; on the other it must help these improvements to be carried out.

My recommendation is an effort to modify the Berkeley machinery to suit our special situation and needs.

I therefore recommend the establishment of a Council for Educational Development, with the following membership and responsibilities, and that the By-Laws and Regulations of Rutgers College be changed accordingly.

Membership

1. There shall be seven voting members, the Dean of the College who will serve as permanent chairman of the Council, and six members of the faculty of the college.

2. The six faculty members shall be elected by the faculty for three-year staggered terms. After the first year of operation, two faculty members shall be elected each year. Because of the nature of the assignment, all faculty members serving on the Council for Educational Development shall be freed of any other committee responsibilities in the college.

3. The Dean shall invite each year chairmen of appropriate committees (faculty and student) to sit with the Council as *ex officio* members.

Responsibilities

1. To stimulate continuing discussion of the principles and effectiveness of our educational program. To this end the Council shall, among other things, hold one well-publicized public meeting each semester both to keep the community informed and to engage as many as possible in discussion of education in the college.

2. To promote experimentation and innovation in all areas of college life; to sponsor, conduct, and direct continuing studies of the needs and opportunities for educational development; to maintain liaison with all appropriate committees on campus, standing and *ad hoc*, faculty and student, on matters of educational effectiveness, innovation, and for the initiation of experimental courses or programs.

3. To determine policy in matters of educational innovation and development, to receive, encourage, and authorize proposals, on a limited and temporary basis, from any individual or group on campus for which no departmental

support is appropriate or feasible; to initiate and administer such experimental instructional programs pending their adoption by a department or other recognized faculty group; to arrange for allocation of funds in support of such programs or courses. An experimental course or program may be continued under the authority of the Council for a period not to exceed five years, after which time it will be reviewed by the faculty of the college for possible inclusion in the regular curriculum and budget, for termination, or for further continuation on an experimental basis.

4. To report annually to the Faculty of Rutgers College on its activities and to prepare, for submission to the established committees of the College, reports on the desirability of transferring existing experimental programs to the regular curriculum.

5. To recommend to the faculty at the appropriate time the granting of a limited number of degrees under its own authority. The Council would thus serve as a degree-granting agency for any experimental or temporary program. It would also undertake to review and accept or reject programs offered by individual students for their own undergraduate education. If, on the basis of petition to the Council, three-quarters of the membership of the Council approves of the individual experimental program and the rationale for it presented by the student, the Council would undertake to "sponsor" the student during his last two years and to recommend him for the degree if the program in question was successfully and satisfactorily completed. The number of degrees the Council undertakes to insure -- either in private or group experimental programs -- cannot exceed 5% of the graduating class of the previous year, except by express consent of the faculty of the college.

6. To seek to be helpful to any program, departmental or non-departmental, already established within the college which seeks and deserves their support.

7. Continuously to evaluate the adequacy of existing educational offerings with a view to establishing priorities for educational development, and to authorize and carry out such studies as may be desirable.

8. To recommend the allocation of funds in support of educational experiment (new and continuing) and to formulate proposals for securing funds for all these purposes from university, foundation, and government sources.

This council would obviously have considerable authority, indeed authority unprecedented for any ordinary committee of the college. But it would be constitutionally responsible to the faculty. Liberalization as proposed here could lead to chaos and aimless diversification within the college but the organization as outlined has several effective controls built into its operation: the role of the Dean, the election by the faculty of the bulk of the membership, constant reporting to the faculty, the presence of *ex officio* members who are chairmen of college committees, the two annual open meetings. In fact, this proposal has significantly more checks and overall faculty control than the similar body at Berkeley and that group has drawn almost universal praise from faculty, students, and administration there. Much of the success of such a Council will depend on what financial resources it is able to muster. But even without new funds, such a body can and will make a significant difference for the whole atmosphere in which education takes place at Rutgers College.

RECOMMENDATION: THE OPEN COLLEGE

This report has concentrated on a variety of efforts to remove a sense of requirement, restriction, and regulation and to replace it with a sense of an open college, flexible, changing, finding values in use, freeing teachers and students to discover new possibilities in themselves and in their work. In a desire to follow through on this policy of an open college, I propose the following:

1. Grades: Grades continue to be a source of considerable student unrest. The general objections to grades are well-founded; students would prefer more lengthy personal evaluations and they are, of course, right. This report recommends something of this sort in the work of the Experimental Semesters. But two factors of considerable significance make the full elimination of grades impossible: (1) the whole system of graduate and professional education demands some sort of comparative system of evaluation, and grades alone seem to serve this function, and (2) I taught for five years at an institution where grades were never given to students during their residence at the college in an effort to do away with unhealthy and anti-social competition. Students, instead, were given lengthy verbal evaluations. All this did was to intensify student interest in grades; never have I spent quite so much time talking with students about how they were doing and never have I seen such psychological distress because they couldn't translate my comments into traditional grades. Students demanded to know how they were doing comparatively; the sense of competition is not invented at the college level nor is it easily eliminated there.

The pass-fail system is at best a devious device that refuses to face any of the issues squarely. The time has come when an open college ought to do just that. With all the weaknesses of any system of grading, we cannot eliminate it completely. Rather than hide behind a growing pass-fail system I propose we take a more daring step. The Rutgers College grading system seems to me one of the best because it is clean and simple; let us simplify it still further.

I recommend that Rutgers College adopt a system of three grades: Distinction, Pass, and Fail for all courses. I propose, in other words, the elimination of the grades of 2 and 4; both are fudge grades. Students as good as ours simply should not be allowed any credit for work that is not clearly pass work and such work ought to be respectably satisfactory, a 3 or pass grade, not a 4. As for the elimination of the 2, it is easier to designate work of genuine distinction and mark it off from merely satisfactory work.

Such a change in grading might have other consequences. There would be no credit for any course in which a student did not receive a pass grade (3); This would, in effect, raise the general college standard. I would recommend at the same time that the college stop calculating cumulative averages. If we found it necessary to play any numbers game at all we could easily note the students of special excellence by the number of distinctions (1) he had on his record. Thus instead of being forced to use differences of tenths of a per cent to "rate" one student over another, it would be relatively easier to distinguish truly outstanding performances. I would hope that rank in class and similar distinctions like Dean's List would also disappear.

2. Examinations: Grades exist because examinations exist and examinations exist because courses exist and we calculate a college education in terms of the number of courses taken and satisfactorily completed. If this were the best of all possible worlds we would not engage in such a system of accumulation and calculation. Students would take what work was necessary to become educated (that is, to meet some overall standard set by the college) and then would be granted a degree. We are forced in the current system to count often too heavily on course examinations and too rarely on a system to check on whether the student is able to use intelligently and in relationship to other knowledge what he acquired in a particular course taken earlier in his college career. I would prefer a system of comprehensive examinations than our current system of course examinations.

After serious investigation, however, I am convinced that such a system for a college of this size and this variety is not feasible. This does not mean that it is not possible, at least, for some departments that wished to experiment along these lines. It does seem that in the major field the idea of comprehensive examinations as a substitute for course examinations might be a possibility, especially if the department had a small number of majors. I propose, therefore, that any department that wishes be allowed to give student majors temporary grades in any course taken in the major department and eliminate the course examination. In the Spring of the student's senior year the department would offer its majors a comprehensive examination based on all the work done in the department (or done for the major in the case of special programs). The grade on the comprehensive examination would then automatically become the grade in all the courses for which temporary grades had previously been assigned. A department might elect to do this for all its majors or for a special group of honor students; or it might offer the option to its students of either course examinations or comprehensives.

In addition to this kind of experimentation, the open college ought to encourage a variety of different kinds of examination experiences: the take-home examination, the oral examination, the analytical essay as a substitute for an examination. In a later section of this report there is further discussion of tests and testing. Investigation indicates that there has been an increase in short-answer examinations in courses as a result of the increase in size of upperclass courses especially. There is nothing intrinsically wrong with such an examination but the time has come when teachers in the college ought to know more about ways and means in testing, when the testing function ought to be enriched with new knowledge and new skills currently available from experts on testing. There should be some annual college publication issued by the office of the Dean where experiments in testing conducted on this campus or suggestions for such experiments might be published for the benefit of the faculty.

3. Ad Hoc Courses: The open college should encourage students, through the Schools, within the dormitories, within departments, or by organizing special groups for that purpose to establish whatever ad hoc courses they wish to, either on their own or with the help of a member of the faculty or a graduate student. In effect, such opportunities have always been open to students. However, Rutgers College ought to announce its willingness to encourage such non-credit courses. The college would require the organizers of the course to provide a statement of the aims and methods as well as the subject matter of the course and the number of students involved. On its part, the college would agree to provide some classroom space, would schedule the course and list it as a non-credit ad hoc course in the Schedule of Recitations or some supplemental bulletin if the course is organized too late for inclusion in the regular Schedule. The organizers would be asked to file some report at the end of the course on the work that had been done, the books that had been discussed, the way the course had proceeded, and some assessment of the value of the course. This record of experimental ad hoc courses would be preserved and published annually (perhaps in the same publication referred to in 2 above). Any student who wished might have the fact of his participation in such a course made part of his scholastic record.

It is high time that students take the initiative in organizing courses they believe are important for them; if they can't get immediate departmental, School, College, or Council for Educational

Development approval quickly enough, they can easily move on their own, with or without the help of faculty or the aid of an advanced student. While it would not be feasible for the college to grant credit for such a course, it could take note of the educational experience and make it a part of the college record. Perhaps some of these student-organized courses might some day become part of the regular offerings.

With a decrease in the student load, it becomes possible for students to take even greater advantage of the opportunities already available on campus and many new ones proposed in this report. Increasingly, it should be apparent to the student at Rutgers College that his education is going to be more and more what he makes it.

4. Guidelines: With the establishment of the Schools and the acceptance of the idea of more individually designed programs for students, efforts should be made by students and college officials to publish a guide to suggested programs of study. Guidelines ought to be proposed and defined. Such a volume might well be regarded as an adjunct to the Handbook (and this year's Handbook constitutes an achievement of exceptional merit). Such a booklet ought to stress not what must be done but what can be done by a student in Rutgers College.

The faculty should go on record in praise of the fine job done by the student committee responsible for the Course and Teacher Evaluation. The effects of this major achievement are still being felt in the college and will continue to be felt. The venture should be continued with all possible faculty cooperation.

However, the evaluation might better concentrate on large introductory and basic courses. After all, the enrollment in most upperclass courses provides a fairly biased audience; students would seldom elect such a course unless they wanted to be there, usually on the basis of information already received from former students in the course. The guide (or some other publication like the one discussed above) should find some new format for dealing with upperclass courses that would allow more discussion of the course, indicating what it attempts to do and how. We need some additional source of information about such courses than provided by the catalog; in certain years, for example, particular courses might be selected for extended discussion and comment; instructors might even be asked to provide a statement of the nature and purpose of the course, some information about the methods of instruction and the kinds of reading and writing done. Such a guide might also highlight whatever kinds of educational experimentation was in process in various courses during the previous year. Two such interesting experiments, for example, were attempted in my own department by colleagues and we have no record or evaluation of them.

Several suggestions in this section of the report have stressed the need for more exchange of information, in the open college, to keep everyone aware of constant changes and exciting challenges in Rutgers College.

5. Auditing: In an effort to keep our college open and lively, students should not only be allowed but should be encouraged to audit any course in the college with the consent of the instructor. There are classroom experiences that can be of value for students even if they are not officially enrolled in the course. We have all heard about dreadful student "shopping around" for courses; I am not at all sure it is so dreadful or that that is the only reason students do audit.

6. Compulsory Attendance: The open college would not require any official record of attendance at any class or at any college function. Any instructor could, if he desired, keep a record of attendance for his own purposes. He might, in the case of prolonged student absence, wish to consult with the appropriate officers of the college. But such reports should not be required and no instructor should feel that he must regard absences as crucial in evaluating a student's work. Obviously, if a class calls for much individual participation a factor like attendance can be most important. But in most cases a decision on the need to regulate attendance should be that of the instructor involved.

7. T-Grades: The open college would be more liberal in allowing students to hand in work late. If it is agreeable to the instructor involved, a temporary or incomplete grade ought to be permissible even when the problem of lateness is not the consequence of illness. Often it is better to allow the student extra time to do a good job than to require him to meet a deadline and do a bad job of limited educational value for him. In any case, this decision should be in the hands of the classroom teacher. There are occasions when the need for carefully regulated office procedure must not take precedence over the education of the student. Obviously, all instructors should be cautious in their use of such privileges.

8. Convocations: The open college needs a way to speak. There have been many occasions--perhaps too many in recent years--when the college has felt the need to provide some central place of meeting and some

central voice to say what appeared necessary on such occasions. I recommend, therefore, to the student body that they arrange (1) for the possibility of reserving somewhere on the schedule for every week a regular special hour at which time a convocation of the college can be held when deemed necessary by the Student Council and that (2) the seniors in the student body elect every year some member of the faculty they feel they would like to have address them on such occasions. This is, perhaps, a little thing, one of the many little things that make up a college and help provide it with a style all its own. There are moments when the college needs somehow to meet in special convocation--and within a few hours or days; there is special significance in having the most experienced students, the seniors, select someone they would appreciate hearing from at such moments.

9. The Junior Year at Home: The open college would make a more suggestive attack on the problem of the relative homogeneity of the student body. This is a serious problem on this campus. We are too much alike, too much bound together by roughly similar backgrounds to be truly open. How do we change the pattern? It is possible to change admissions policies or to encourage all existing efforts to provide an ever-growing body of students from what is now called culturally deprived backgrounds. I know how serious that effort has been and yet how disappointingly small the results. But here is a well-developed program worthy of additional student and faculty support.

There is another idea I have proposed for some years with no serious response. Many colleges have Junior Year Abroad programs (we do); I have called for a Junior Year at Home program. I would like to see the college engage in negotiations with colleges in other parts of the country, colleges where students represent a very different background from that of our own students', colleges whose special programs offer opportunities to study subjects not offered on our campus (like pre-Columbian archeology, for example), colleges located in a physical or social environment different from our own. The purpose of such negotiations would be to arrange the possible exchange of a group of students for one or two semesters in the Junior year, to allow their students to replace ours on campus while our students are given the same opportunity on their campus. Such a program of exchanges might prove most beneficial to all parties, not only in terms of enriching the personal experience of all involved, enriching the life of all campuses by introducing new elements, but also in many cases opening up areas of study not available locally. While the plan is initially designed to keep the campus as open as possible to a variety of voices and influences and to provide our students the widest possible variety of educational opportunities, it might be possible to add to this a program of organized exchange of faculty. An exchange of students and faculty was contemplated several years ago in a proposal introduced to seek such a reciprocal relationship with a Black college.

I recommend to the college the immediate establishment by the Dean of a special student-faculty committee to examine and report of the feasibility of the establishment of a Junior Year at Home Program.

RECOMMENDATION: THE APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAM

The current student challenge to the established order on American campuses has centered largely on the issue of increased participation in the life of the college. Nothing is more central to that life than the primary functions of teaching and research and no meaningful participation can ever exist unless students can be actively engaged in those aspects of the college situation rather than remaining passive recipients. This report has already proposed the use of upperclassmen to advise and even teach less advanced students; it has stressed the importance of students teaching one another; it has urged that every student be given some opportunity to "do" as well as to "take" in his chosen discipline. This proposal is an effort to extend these modest beginnings to achieve student participation in the very core of college life.

I propose that the Dean establish a faculty-student committee to undertake the organization and promotion of a voluntary apprenticeship program to be sponsored by Rutgers College.

(1) Such a group would first gather information about available funds (Economic Opportunity grants and other such programs) that currently can and are being used to finance students working for individual faculty members and departments on a variety of projects assisting in research.

(2) It would attempt to investigate other possible sources for additional funds to hire students for such work and would publicize the existence of such funds both to students and faculty.

(3) It would serve as a clearinghouse for both students who wanted such employment assisting faculty and departments in both research and teaching projects and faculty members and departments who had use for such assistance.

(4) In addition to arranging such opportunities involving some financial support for students, the committee would encourage students to volunteer to serve as apprentices to faculty members (or in departments) on research projects involving either library or laboratory or in the classroom as aides in actual teaching situations.

(5) It would investigate the possibility of the involvement of students in the research of the wide variety of institutes that exist on the University campus

in New Brunswick but which play currently an almost insignificant role in the life of undergraduates and their education. Hopefully, apprentices could also function effectively in at least some of these operations as paid or unpaid volunteer assistants in research. These research institutes could thereby play a much more vital role in the educational process.

(6) It would publicize the existence of these apprenticeship programs as a part of the opportunity offered to students at Rutgers College.

The program would be voluntary; the faculty, department, or institute would obviously have the right to make its own selection of student assistants or apprentices. Students would be free to turn down any assignment. The idea behind the program is simple: to involve students who wished to be involved (either for pay, if possible, or simply because of the chance provided to learn in a new way by collaborating with a member of the faculty) in these most vital areas of college life. This could mean exciting participation in a scholarly project of significance, working closely with an eminent scholar or teacher and learning much in the process. It could mean a newer respect for the ability of students on the part of some faculty. It could make for that "closer contact" students seem always to talk about wanting with faculty. Obvious practical consequences follow in the form of free assistance for research and teaching, but as in any apprentice system the results ought to be mutually rewarding, even if money is not involved.

Once again, the idea of academic credit would seem to be inappropriate, but it ought to be possible to indicate such apprentice service on the student's permanent record and such service would also be of value as additional evidence of interest and training for those seeking to go on to graduate or professional schools.

I am convinced that it is important to get our students into the classrooms and the laboratories, into the library and the studies as more than listeners and passive observers. I am convinced that they ought to be doing, to be engaged in and aware of what the teachers and scholars on this campus are doing. This voluntary apprenticeship program is one way in which these ends might be achieved. With sufficient promotion and participation such a program could also radically alter the campus style and provide a special aspect of life in Rutgers College.

RECOMMENDATION:
SKILLS AND TESTING CENTER

Much fun has been had at the expense of American universities--especially our state universities--where the range of subjects taught has often seemed ridiculous: the practical stood side by side with the theoretical, the earthy with the ethereal, hotel administration with metaphysics. At my own Alma Mater, for example, its founder Ezra Cornell announced that his would be an institution where any student could obtain instruction in any subject, and he may have just about succeeded.

This was in part the ideal of the inspiration that founded the state universities and it was not all wrong. The great mistake, and one that must be remedied if the modern university is to become truly contemporary, was in that failure to separate those courses that provided training and skills from those that were primarily concerned with fundamental questions that engaged the life of the mind. It is often, but not always, difficult to make a sharp distinction. The point is that few colleges or universities make any real distinctions at all. Therefore, they tend to equate all courses or refuse to offer some that would be of value to students because they would be difficult to justify as academically worthwhile. Worse, they often offer such courses and are forced into fraudulent intellectual justifications that do no honor to the ideals of learning and truth. Universities often do offer adults and the general public a whole range of courses that frequently stress skills and practical subjects in what are known as Extension Divisions. Yet no effort is made to provide such opportunities to college students who might very well benefit from such work.

This proposal argues that the University ought to provide--through its existing Extension Division or through a totally new structure--a whole series of free, non-credit courses providing such valuable skills and training. Such courses would not have to be taught in lock-step with other, more traditional courses; they might be given at intervals designed better to serve student needs. Some might be designed to use effectively the new educational technology. Teaching machines are a significant advance and brilliantly suited to the purposes of teaching basic skills and providing basic drill in a wide variety of areas at the speed and for the individual needs of the individual learner. Yet I know of nowhere on this campus where there is any significant experimentation with such machines. Systematic testing in this field of new approaches to a whole range of programmed learning with a view to determine overall effectiveness and applicability is essential in any modern university scheme. The demonstrated success of such devices on the level of teaching at least basic skills (including subjects like elementary logic, mathematics, language) suggests that a skills center might be precisely the place to institute some centralized experimentation for the university as a whole. (Such a center might eventually offer short courses--much the way the computer services currently do--for faculty interested in using aspects of the new technology for their own teaching in the college.)

There is a wide range of skills and subjects eminently worthwhile but somehow not in keeping with traditional views of the liberal arts, from elementary bookkeeping to basketweaving, from basic language instruction to techniques of film making, that ought to be made available. It is almost as absurd to scorn such subjects and skills as unworthy as it is to give college credit for successful completion of them. Separated from the routine of the academic work of the college, designed to serve and meet specific and immediate student needs, offered by competent people who are practitioners and need not therefore be scholars, on a schedule that best suits the demands of the subject and the abilities of the student, such courses might prove a truly valuable adjunct to the life of the college. There might be, in fact, various courses currently taught in the colleges in New Brunswick that might better be located in such a center.

Why not provide easy and free opportunities to learn speed reading and typing? Why not a place to brush up on mathematical skills or to take elementary training in the nature and use of computers or even elementary statistics when one does not need or wish a full and more academically enriched approach to such subjects? Why not teach the basic languages through such a program and even provide language refresher courses? Why not have courses designed more conveniently to move at the pace of the student, something of great importance in the establishment of basic skills? Why should it take a student, for example, two or three years to master the basics of a language when more concentrated work might make the language available to him when he needs it? (The German Department offers a special non-credit German Reading course for graduate students. Most students who take the course are able to pass a German qualifying examination. Yet we offer no such service to our undergraduates who might wish to learn a language rapidly to meet some felt need and often a more intellectually satisfactory one than the "need" of the graduate student.)

Such a center might also provide instruction in the practical side of more creative fields: photography, motion pictures, basic design. We still do too little on the college level with the whole business of visual awareness. This aspect of man's experience receives but the slightest attention on our campus. We should provide greater opportunities in this area but, again, much work in this field does not quite fit into usual schedules of courses and traditional ways of counting credits and awarding grades. Students should be afforded the chance to paint, draw, cartoon; to weave and experiment with ceramics.

Since one of the key functions for such a center would be to provide feedback into the regular teaching program of the college--students would approach regular academic work with new skills and awareness and certain educational techniques would be demonstrated experimentally in the center--it might be possible for such a center to operate in several ways to make this whole area of visual awareness play a more meaningful role in general education at the college. At the most obvious level, such a center might have a division responsible for maintaining for the University at large a major collection of audio-visual materials for classroom use and a staff competent to assist faculty members to prepare for the best use of them.

The University has repeatedly failed in recent years to maintain anything like a reasonable audio-visual center. We should have a major library of films, slides, transparencies, records, and other similar materials for classroom use. We should have effective and operating machines to enable us to use such materials and people capable of operating them. This should not be an individual department matter. We should have, as well, easy access to trained personnel equipped to offer teachers who wish it the latest knowledge and the newest skills in the field of audio-visual instruction. Currently, any effort to improve classroom instruction by the introduction of such materials and techniques is not only unaided by college and university facilities but it is actually hindered by conditions as they now exist. Perhaps with the existence of such a division in the proposed center it would become possible to make awareness of the world through the use of eyes and ears more central to the experience of our students.

Since considerable stress is put in this report on the ability of students to plan their own programs intelligently, on the basis of the best advice and the best information, it becomes central to such an experience for students to have the best available knowledge about their own abilities, aptitudes, and achievements. We need some central division of testing to prepare and execute such tests as we, as a college, or an individual student might find necessary or valuable. The existence of a major testing center serving all the New Brunswick colleges would pool all existing resources and expand them. It would have at least three primary functions:

(1) The individual student might find what basic skills he lacked to do better work and might therefore know whether or not to undertake a skills course at the center. He might be helped in areas of course selection, not simply in the sense that he could learn of vocational aptitudes he possessed, but also because such a center might provide the kind of tests that would enable him to know, for example, where he rated among his fellow students in terms of general command in fields like science, social science, and the humanities. He might be able to discover through testing whether he was ready to take advanced work in some area. Such a center might take over the job of administering proficiency examinations in certain fields and courses. He could also learn a good deal about himself as a person as well as a potential scholar from a wide battery of tests. From all these tests the student would receive great self-awareness.

(2) Tests more generally administered by the center at the request of the college and the records of all testing done by the center would provide essential information for further changes and adjustments in the living curriculum of the college. It is imperative that we have solid information about our students. This report, based as it is on a thorough reading of such data as was available from testing of this sort done at comparable institutions and from some limited testing done on this campus, recommends that only such constant further testing can ever enable us to keep our curriculum flexible enough to meet the needs of all interests on campus.

(3) The existence of a major testing center on campus might have consequences for the immediate educational process as well in providing, for those instructors who wished it, help in preparing tests, knowledge about new techniques in testing, a fuller understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of current testing procedures. As long as any testing continues to play a role in the life of the college it would seem wise to have available the techniques, abilities, and services of experts and testing devices useful to the college as part of its program of instruction.

RECOMMENDATION: THE IMPROVEMENT OF TEACHING

I really don't know precisely how to describe good teaching because there are so many kinds of teaching excellence and therefore am more than a little dubious that I can point any way to the improvement of teaching. You can't make good teachers by offerings rewards and special prizes. Obviously, a man's teaching, his ability in the classroom (judged at best in haphazard ways) ought to count more seriously in matters of appointment and promotion than it normally does. But none of this really gets us very far. But we can perhaps do something to encourage more effective classroom teaching by improving the conditions in which instructors operate or by at least eliminating obstacles to effective performance.

1. Above all other things it is imperative that students in the college recognize that there are different teachers with different interests and different skills. They should learn to appreciate, admire, and accept this diversity and should not demand (even silently) that all teachers be the same. They must begin by making an effort, not to judge a teacher by some rigidly fixed standard or by some ideal expectation, to see what any individual teacher, following his own philosophy and procedures, might in fact have to offer. The student should make an attempt to reshape his instruction in a classroom to his own purposes and not necessarily try to reshape an instructor or his course in his own image of what such an instructor or course ought to be. Students rightly ask for the opportunity to do their own thing and they should extend this privilege to their teachers as well.

2. This does not mean that the student must accept all things that pass as teaching without question. The aid that individual instructors can and ought to receive from activities like the Course and Teacher Evaluation published last Spring should continue, supplemented by as much individual comment and suggestion from students as possible. Methods should be found to provide instructors with such analyses every year (offered anonymously, perhaps, but it would be helpful if the instructor could know how well the student was doing in the course). Students tend to be terribly patient and strangely embarrassed about informing their instructors of weaknesses easily corrected. One student told me indignantly about a teacher who mumbled so badly he couldn't be understood; another reported an instructor who, when he lectured, frequently wrote on the blackboard with his back to the students so that for much of the time he could not be heard. In neither case did the student think it proper to inform the instructors politely these failings. In addition to the kind of evaluation

discussed, the new organization of the advising sections in the major department might also provide an opportunity for intelligent discussion of teaching and teaching techniques and suggestions for improving both.

3. Reduction of the teaching load, already recommended, is an obvious way to improve conditions of teaching. With more time to prepare classes and less classroom responsibilities teachers might do a better job.

4. The easy availability of aids to teaching and the chance to learn from experts about the use of the old and the new technology of education (from audio-visual materials to television to systems of programmed instruction) makes possible innovation in teaching that might improve many courses. The same would hold true about the whole area of testing and testing techniques.

5. Good courses depend on rethinking and redefining; the best of courses grow stale. Yet it is rare for leave to be granted to anyone to improve a course. I know of two instances in my own department where men took considerable time and energy to redesign courses long criticized by the undergraduates and by others on the staff. Such work was obviously essential, but it required a considerable personal sacrifice on the part of the men who assumed such responsibilities in addition to their on-going obligations. They received no special credit for undertaking these burdens and in one instance one faculty member was criticized because as a result his scholarly output lagged. This is simply absurd; leave for improvement of teaching must become as common as leave for scholarship if the college and the university genuinely believe in course and teaching improvement.

In addition to practice of regular leave, semester or full year, I would argue for the possible use of Summer School as a locus for work on course improvement. Could not an instructor (especially in the larger introductory courses in which teaching or laboratory assistants are used) with some ideas about remaking a course propose a kind of "institute" for the summer in which such a course might be designed or where some experimental syllabus might be tested with the teaching assistants participating as students (possibly for course credit?) and a limited number of regular Summer School clients enrolled as both students and "test animals?" In this way there could be a regular Summer School salary for the instructor that would really be a way of underwriting the redesign of a course. Presumably, the teaching assistants might be paid, receive credit, and certainly by the Fall be more thoroughly trained so that their participation in the course during the regular school year would be improved.

6. The College should urge the officials of the University to seek immediately some budgetary grant -- similar

to that currently making possible the effective work of the Research Council -- to finance a Council on Teaching as a sign of the University's genuine concern for the advancement not only of learning but also of teaching on all campuses of the University.*

I believe, further, that if such a Council is formed that it should consider applications for leave from teachers proposing to work directly on improvement of teaching and courses but also from those who may wish to engage in some sort of community or public service work of one kind or another. Such leave and the experience it might afford could have an important and salutary effect on the teaching a man might do, the kind of courses he might give, and even the kind of research he might produce. Paid leave for public service should not, therefore, be regarded as something extra or special; it can play a role in shaping the life style of the college and improve what happens on the campus and in the classroom.

It is about time that the University and the College recognize that often faculty members regard themselves as concerned citizens who might be able to make a special contribution off as well as on the campus. This is in keeping with the great ideals of the state university; it would also draw more closely together the campus and the wider world.

7. Of all of the many problems on campus to which I do not know the answer, the most baffling is the increase in the size of classes. We can talk of overall load reduction but what can we do about growth in course size? The problem looms larger in the immediate future when new students at Livingston College will probably be availing themselves of work in our upperclass courses more regularly than our students will be able to enroll in such work at our sister college. (This is a problem for the immediate future only; generally, for example, the balance between Rutgers College and Douglass has resulted in a fairly equal interchange of students.)

The apparently obvious and rational answer is to add more teachers and more course options. It sounds rational: it doesn't work. A rough study of the three most popular departments at three institutions reveals that, on the contrary, if students elect to take courses in a department in sufficient numbers to lead to the hiring of additional personnel the result is that the total department tends to pick up still more students; the greater the variety of offerings in a department the more readily students undertake to do work in that department. Certainly, popular courses rarely decline in appeal; they tend rather to increase.

---

*Collectors of Rutgers' reform proposals over the years will recall this one is not new.

One answer would seem to be to offer additional sections of the more popular and highly sought after courses rather than proliferate new more highly specialized courses. The sectioning of larger underclass or introductory courses would also be a more desirable way to use what new personnel is available. Teaching assistants and even undergraduate apprentice teaching assistants might provide valuable service in handling sections for discussion or tutorials in large courses. In some cases it would be possible for such sections to take off, in a sense, on their own and develop a kind of specialized seminar group within the limits of the larger lecture group, working on a project or projects related to the basic outline of the course but more specialized and keeping within the interests of the students in that section.

The way to solve the problem is not to cut off enrollments. There obviously must be limited enrollments in certain courses; every department, for example, ought to be able to offer its majors a chance to work in a small-class situation "doing" or "reading" in his field. But there is nothing intrinsically wrong with the large lecture course; it remains an important and valuable means of teaching. It can, as suggested, be adapted to a variety of uses by sectioning. Obviously, this report is dedicated to the view that no student should have to expect all of this work to come in this form; he should be assured the chance for a variety of kinds of classes and instruction. But cutting off of enrollments, limiting the number who can take a course, while understandable (and on rare occasions because of the lack of classrooms of sufficient size) all too often deprives a student of the very work from which he would most profit because of his interest and motivation. Schemes to provide places in a course by rank in class or any other such device have no place in an open college. To force a student to substitute courses in which he has limited interest or for which he feels no need shows a special kind of bureaucratic callousness and suggests to a student that one course is the same as any other course. It is intellectually irresponsible to tell a student that all he needs is a number of courses and that the college really does not care whether he wants those particular courses or not. Here, without question, the means is determined to defeat the end!

8. In spite of criticism to the contrary, some of the very test teaching done on any campus is done by teaching assistants. Some of the criticism is no doubt justified but even then it may in fact be the responsibility of the department and the professor for whom the teaching assistant works. Clearly, there must be a more sustained effort to instruct the teaching assistant in what to do in the classroom, to supervise what it is he does do. The new graduate program in the History Department, for example, gives all of its first-year students in American history some brief experience in classroom teaching under supervision

with careful preparation and criticism as part of the regular training. Such a policy might well be instituted by those departments in which some comparable scheme is not now in operation.

One of the problems of the teaching assistant as teacher may rest in his title itself. The image created, for the undergraduate and perhaps for the teaching assistant himself, may be a bad one. Couldn't we somehow find a new description of his function? Would it upset the nature of the university if he could somehow become an instructor rather than a TA? If such a change could be made, perhaps departments could make the next step: treat all such new "instructors" as members of the staff of the course at all times. They should obviously be involved in all stages of the planning for a course whenever possible (this would mean careful appointment and assignment of these instructors in the Spring for the following year, if at all possible). You may get better teaching out of instructors if they are involved and if in a sense the course was in some part theirs to shape. Hopefully, they would also learn from such participation. Final responsibility for the nature and content of the course rests with the faculty member in charge and he cannot yield that responsibility. But certainly treating young instructors as colleagues makes for a better overall course experience.

9. There is a growing resentment everywhere on campuses toward faculty members who take time from their teaching or their contact with students to engage in research and writing. There is especially considerable annoyance expressed when faculty members absent themselves from campus to take leave for such purposes. Any good college must stress research and publication; this whole report assumes the maintenance of the highest standards of scholarship on the part of the faculty and the most rigorous scholarly standards expressed in classroom offerings.

It is usually a fact that research leads to the improvement of the quality of a man's teaching. But all too many times students fail to see this consequence; they do not see the value or significance for them of a man's research. To break down this gap in understanding and to make it even more apparent that the scholar is after all an integral element in the college life, I propose that every member of the college who receives a research leave (whether such research is sponsored by the university or not) be required as part of his leave to find a way of reporting back to his college community on his return to campus, in the form of a formal lecture, an informal talk, a special seminar, etc. Such a report might be best made to the department or the School; or it might be made to a larger college audience. It should involve some discussion of what he has done, his methods of procedure, his discoveries, his problems. Thus the students would get some sense of the process of scholarship, some sense of participation in a community of scholars. No doubt the faculty member will some day publish his findings but why should it not also be his responsibility to his college to share with its members the excitement and difficulties, the achievements and failures of his own research? I am aware that similar procedures do already exist in some departments. I propose that this be extended so that it becomes a college regulation and a condition of leave.

RECOMMENDATION: THE SCHEDULE

The time has come, in the interest of maintaining a flexible and open college to call into serious question the whole operation of the current schedule with its 75-minute periods and its strange distribution of class hours. It would appear that any changes in that schedule would have to be New Brunswick-wide in scope and therefore I would recommend that the college urge the Provost to undertake to establish a university-wide committee to recommend possible changes in the current scheduling practice.

There are several major objections generally voiced: (1) 75 minutes is simply too long a period to maintain effective student concentration; (2) the current arrangement is much too inflexible; it makes it very hard to break down large classes, for example, into smaller sections for one meeting a week, something becoming increasingly desirable in many courses; (3) the existing pattern is very wasteful of student and faculty time.

The present arrangement generally assumes that all courses are very much alike and that they can therefore be easily taught within the same time frame. Obvious exceptions were made in the original scheme: the language courses, some large introductory courses, for example. But no further exceptions are allowed and any readjustment of course meeting arrangements is virtually impossible. For some courses the current schedule means not only too long sessions but also too lengthy a period between class meetings.

I have heard several proposals for revision of the schedule, but I hesitate at this stage to make any specific proposal other than to urge a restudy of the whole operation based on a more thorough canvass of the faculty and the students.

I would like to see Rutgers College attempt one experiment, if it should become possible with a new scheduling pattern. I have seen it in operation on two other campuses and have been impressed with the results. The idea is a simple one: there is one day during the week (generally a Wednesday or a Thursday) on which no classes are held. Students are thereby free to spend the whole day in reading, research, and writing uninterrupted by the need to attend classes or to face any other obligations. Such a day of work, study, and contemplation has proven itself elsewhere as a valuable addition to the schedule. The students are truly able to accomplish significant work and the breather the day provides from the routine of classroom work seems somehow to refresh everyone.

It might be possible, if such an arrangement were to become feasible under a new schedule proposal, to use that same day of student freedom from classes as the one day on which all faculty meetings--including departmental and committee--might easily be scheduled. It is especially important that faculty meetings can be held when there is more time for full and effective discussion and debate. The current pattern of 4:30 meetings generally means it is difficult to meet for more than an hour or an hour and a half and no faculty with any serious issue of academic policy to discuss can possibly complete its business within such a short time.

Certainly the time has come to reconsider the possibilities of schedule revision (I think even the question of Saturday morning classes, since this is no longer a commuter college primarily, and the question of evening classes for undergraduates ought to be reopened). Above all, we want the most flexible possible schedule, designed to make possible the maximum kind of individual variation to encourage different kinds of teaching and experimentation in presentation of materials.

RECOMMENDATION:
LIBRARY AND BOOKSTORE

The heart of any college is its library -- and Rutgers College doesn't have one. High on any list of priorities ought to be the establishment of a workable undergraduate library. The current Rutgers University Library serves too many functions to be a fully effective instrument in undergraduate teaching; the demands made upon it are simply too great.

During the last two years under acting director, Dr. Norman Stevens, the library has, however, tried to make every effort to make itself of service to the teaching staff and the undergraduates. Yet in spite of heroic efforts and intelligent cooperation previously denied, the library is still a source of genuine discontent to faculty and students alike. The reserve system simply fails to operate; the lack of a system of effective book recall hampers most effective use of the library for teaching purposes.

Insofar as the library is an aspect of the teaching situation in the college it would seem reasonable to assume that in those areas most directly associated with its teaching functions, policy decisions should be made not simply by the library but by the library in collaboration with the college. Expression of policy positions and college needs by the faculty of the college and its committee ought to play a significant role in the governing of the library in these matters. Such would involve, among other things, decisions about hours and days open, reserve policy (which is strictly a teaching function) and recall policy.

There must be a significant effort to keep the library open longer hours and most especially on days when there may be no classes; the tendency for the library to shorten hours or not open at all during times when there are official recesses in the college calendar does not make sense.

But all of these suggestions are less significant than some basic reform of the reserve system. The reserve room itself is simply not big enough for the demands of readers requiring books and courses requesting space to shelve books for reserve. It remains possible, in spite of constant complaints, for a student to take a volume from reserve early in the day and keep it without using it all day long, depriving other readers of the opportunity to read it. There is no effective file of what books are on reserve and one cannot discover this easily; you have to know the course for which a title may be listed on reserve to know whether that title is in fact there.

I would propose that the current reserve operation be limited to books that would be available for only a limited period (let us say 2 hours) and that fines would be instituted if a book is not returned within that time period. A card catalog -- alphabetical by author -- would be maintained in the reserve room listing all the titles on the two-hour reserve.

Any faculty member would be asked to limit the number of books placed on two-hour reserve and intended for the reserve room. But in exchange for this self-imposed limitation, the library would agree to adopt a system of tagging books left in the stacks but designed for special reserve purposes; there could be books designated as two-day books that would have to be returned within the times specified or face a fine; other books might clearly be tagged one-week books and treated in a similar manner. In other words, I am proposing that there be several kinds of reserves, all intended to make reading material easily available to the maximum number of students who wish to use them. Any college interested in effective teaching ought to know how important reading done for the work of a course can be and the effort to replace library use with paperbacks purchased by the students simply does not work in all instances and grows more and more expensive every day. We need a more flexible reserve system, one that keeps a minimum number of students in the unpleasant reserve room at any time and yet provides the maximum opportunity to get at reading materials essential to the operation of an effective course.

The bookstore has improved so clearly in recent years that it seems almost criminal to continue to berate it for the job it is not doing and for the job it seems, in fact, unable to do. We do not have a genuine college bookstore, however, and even the collection of paperback volumes is unsatisfactory. But the store stocks almost no hardcover books of value and while its range of magazines has improved over the years, it remains pitiful.

There has been so much talk about this problem over so many years that one despairs of finding any answer that will work; like the library it just goes on not working toward the end of making the kind of over-all academic environment essential for quality education.

Perhaps the solution might be a significant off-campus venture of faculty and students in organizing a cooperative bookstore. The idea ought to be examined once again; it has great appeal not only because it would mean that policy could be determined by those whose interest is at stake but also because the operation of such a venture is in itself a valuable and interesting experience for all who have ever played a part in such an enterprise.

RECOMMENDATION: COMMITMENT TO COMMUNITY SERVICE

There is no issue more vital in the current student protests and demonstrations around the world than the question of the proper relationship between the college and the wider community. It is good that it is being raised and important that we keep it, as a college, ever before us, for it represents some of the most fundamental moral and political concerns in the Western tradition and calls into question the whole definition of education itself. The discussion of these issues can be translated into an effective educational service not only for our students but for all members of the college community. Faculty members, too, debate these matters and make private decisions about their own relationship with the non-academic community, and administrators face serious questions in accepting grants and undertaking projects at the behest of the larger community.

This problem takes on a special coloration on the campus of a college that is a part of a state university. The basic assumptions behind that extraordinary idea in the history of modern education, the American state university, were that the university would be of service, that knowledge would be made useful, and that the educated man might serve and enrich his community.

One reason for our lack of a proper self-image at Rutgers and therefore for our lack of essential respect for ourselves and our fellows is a peculiar view of a state university which is prevalent among students and perhaps some of the faculty as well. For too many students to be part of a state university means to lack the prestige of other colleges. The whole idea of the state university needs to be reinvigorated in New Jersey; it needs to be endowed with special significance both for the state as a whole and for the students who are privileged to attend its university.

For these reasons, I propose that as a college we undertake the obligation of individual and collective service to the state and to the local community, and that we do so to keep alive the great debate about the proper relationship between society and its educational institutions and to reinvest the idea of the state university with new significance.

What I have in mind is something relatively general at this stage. Many of our students, of course, are already involved in a variety of projects that serve

New Brunswick or an even wider community; there exist worthwhile programs of internships in various governmental agencies. I propose, however, that we make it an assumption that all of our students, during at least two of their last three years as members of the college community, dedicate at least two weeks each year (or the equivalent thereof) in some self-selected area of service to the wider community. This would be considered a necessary and vital part of everyone's educational experience and a characteristic of the life style at Rutgers College.

Students would often be able to use the skills and knowledge acquired in the college; undoubtedly, in the practice of such service they would be learning much of value. But I do not propose that this service be simply another course or a means of amassing credit. To fulfill the ideal of education and knowledge for citizenship, this should be a free grant of time, energy, and ability in exchange for the gift of education which the state itself makes.

I propose that the college establish a standing committee on the Community Service Commitment composed of faculty, students, and that official of the college, working through and with the Office of the Dean of the College and the Dean of Students designated by the Dean as [illegible] authorized to organize and coordinate such activities. Various institutions and organizations that already exist on campus (from religious groups to units of the university such as Urban Studies, Labor Relations, Eagleton, Alcohol Studies, etc. which currently play such a limited role in the life of undergraduates) be called upon to provide guidance and some leadership in the development of worthwhile projects. Surely, cooperation with the Graduate School of Education, the Graduate School of Social Work, and possibly even the Medical School might prove fruitful here as well.

Students seem anxious for involvement; the college should foster such involvement. There should be no specific set of projects that must be undertaken or even any particular definition of service. Each student should come to his own decision about how he best can serve. While there will obviously develop a series of programs administered by the committee and its executive officer, students should be encouraged to work up their own ideas and proposals. Above all, the great conversation about the meaning of service must continue. There must be fullest discussion and debate; each student must have the freedom to define his own vision of service and defend that vision in discussion with other students and the committee. It is important that all of the ethical and political implications be brought out in open debate.

Further, to insure this end, I propose that every Spring there be held a special convocation of the college on the Commitment to Community Service. At such a public occasion the college would have an opportunity annually to reaffirm its participation in this program, to renew its covenant for service; faculty, students, and administrators would have a forum to debate anew issues involving the relations between college and society. The issue of how we best can serve, the issue of what is demanded of the citizen, the issue of our obligations to the state and society, the issue of the relationship of learning to life, the issue of the relationship of the university to the world--none of these will ever be settled. They will remain central in our vision of education at Rutgers College, a part of the State University of New Jersey. This proposal is not a requirement in the traditional sense. It represents rather a willing acceptance by our students of one of the fundamental ideals identified with the college, and Rutgers College will be known as that college that accepts a commitment for community service as a necessary characteristic of membership in its community.

RECOMMENDATION: THE RUTGERS COLLEGE PROJECT

The recommendations of this report have argued the need for more complete and effective involvement of students and faculty; that requirements and restrictions be replaced by cooperative efforts to build individual college programs that make sense as a whole in terms of individual needs and interests and that are developed as the result of wide discussion and consultation; that the total campus environment must be considered as an essential part of the curriculum and of learning; that there is a need to provide even more effective centers on action and work on campus in an effort to improve a sense of overall identification and provide the college with a life style all its own; that we keep at the center of our learning and teaching strong departments increasingly made responsible for encouraging their major students to see their particular subjects in the most meaningful total context of humane or liberal studies; that we introduce a series of new programs centered around key issues designed to achieve that same end, stressing the interrelatedness of various kinds of learning without the loss of the special sense of discipline. The ideal of a Rutgers College education, I have insisted, ought to be increased awareness of the world, of the various kinds of phenomena and experiences and the ways we can best make such awareness effective and meaningful for the individual and for society.

Nowhere has the report seen fit to recommend the establishment of special interdisciplinary courses. Rather, it has proposed structural change that might encourage or sponsor such activities and has argued that intelligent and thoughtful program-making might well foster on the part of the individual student an even more significant sense of such interrelationships. It has assumed that such individual effort to think through relationships between studies might be an even more effective way than interdisciplinary courses designed to do the work for the students rather than encouraging them to do it themselves.

The proposal I make here is yet another attempt along these lines and an attempt ambitiously -- perhaps too ambitiously -- designed as well to implement almost all the other goals referred to above.

I propose that each year Rutgers College undertake, as a total college project, the analysis of a special subject, a special "question of the year."

I propose that once such a topic is accepted and a committee of students and faculty members is established to administer the Rutgers College Project for the year an effort be made to encourage all teachers who might be able in all courses where it might be relevant to include some reading, discussion, or analysis of the question or perhaps to emphasize it more centrally than they would have previously. Further, I propose that additional efforts be made to make the question central to discussion and to the life of the campus by concentrating on various aspects of it in many activities usually considered extra-curricular: lecture series by distinguished visitors expert on various aspects of the question; symposia where both students and faculty, visiting and local, read papers, discuss or debate issues; special seminars on various aspects of the question, special informal discussion groups; the preparation and distribution of special reading lists and the active cooperation of the library and the bookstore in providing material; the use not only of lecture visitors but of film series, art exhibits, concerts (when possible) to provide yet additional perspectives on the theme. The possibilities are, of course, almost literally endless: the point is to attempt to achieve a mobilization of all resources on campus and to encourage as total a participation as possible so that as many as can be encouraged do participate and what is more important do contribute. Each from his own interest and perspective, from his own studies and discipline can bring something special to the total analysis; each, hopefully, can take away from such participation with others with different interests and from a different academic base, something new of value. Thus by the mobilization of such total campus facilities and talents, by the use of every means available, the whole campus each year for a part of its effort is engaged in the most extensive and exciting interdisciplinary project -- without having to design special courses and create new structures or even finding new financial resources.

I need not emphasize how this kind of effort might break down barriers between groups and disciplines and how the kind of interaction suggested might lead to a greater sense of total Rutgers College identification: this would be something in which all Rutgers College were participating (or more honestly could participate: I have no illusions that anything, even a football game, can or even should provide for total participation). Such a project ought to be regarded as basic each year, however, to the life of the campus -- a center of intellectual life shared by the full college membership.

Such a question or theme would have to be selected a year in advance and an undergraduate and graduate student-faculty committee to oversee the operation would of necessity have to be established at the same time. The committee's job would be difficult -- the correlation of a variety of activities and the arrangement of facilities, etc., and if the idea were adopted I would propose the designation of some official who might serve permanently (perhaps an assistant dean, part time teaching, part time administering) as Rutgers

College Project Director. Work on the committee itself would clearly have significant educational value -- for both faculty and students who served for effective sponsorship of such a program in any year would require considerable learning, consultation, and even a little research.

I would finally propose that the results of each year's analysis -- a summary of the program, the bibliography, the best papers or lectures given, transcripts of the best discussions or seminars, pictures of exhibitions, etc. -- an edited record and perhaps evaluation of the year's work on the project be published (if at all possible) by the Rutgers University Press so that at least all members of the college might obtain a copy. In fact, a truly effective program would result in a volume that would be a valuable contribution to scholarship itself. Such a volume, once again, ought to be edited by the committee, students as well as faculty. The additional experience of editing and publishing would be of considerable educational benefit to students. But most significantly, at the end of a college career any student might possess, not only a yearbook, but also four volumes representing the results of intellectual adventures in which he played a personal role. How many college students can make that claim?

Obviously, I have been very general in spelling out the possibilities involved. There are clearly many more -- Henry Rutgers students might decide to undertake theses related to the question of the year, for example -- that would occur to a committee and that might develop over the years. Obviously, the whole idea rests on the need for the utmost cooperation (unless, for example, some instructors and some courses do not participate in some degree, the idea of a more total involvement becomes less significant.) The point would be to relate what does go on in the classroom to what goes on on the campus as a whole which, hopefully, will finally suggest an even wider link to the world beyond the campus.

This discussion has been, perhaps, much too general. I might better make the concept clearer if I sketched in a slightly more specific proposal that I have already made to the Dean of the College about a possible program for next year. Next fall we will "celebrate" an anniversary: it has been 40 years since the Great Depression of 1929. While there are obviously many studies of the impact of that event, there is really surprisingly little analysis of many questions of importance. Could we not use the occasion for an effort to achieve a full-scale assault on all aspects of the question, what in fact *was* the impact of the depression? (Our final summary volume title: *Rutgers College Analyzes the Great Depression*.)

There is hardly a field of inquiry that could not be called upon, if not simply to analyze the impact of that event in terms of the techniques of its discipline, then surely to investigate the special impact the event might have had on the discipline itself, its ability to operate, the kind of problems it might have focused attention upon because of the event, the changes in institutional structures which affected it as a discipline. Obviously demographers, economists, sociologists, historians, students of the arts, historians, and sociologists of science and technology would be immediately involved. There are clearly any number of courses already given on the campus in the humanities and the social sciences where it would not be unfair to expect possible cooperation in terms of additional or even new stress on problems related to the depression (even courses not dealing with historical material or with the 20th century might raise a more general problem about the consequence of any other or more generally, any depression). The effect on individuals and families; on child-rearing and psychological theory; on schools and education; on scientific inquiry and technology; on housing and health; on religion and philosophy; on literature and the arts; on architecture and urban development; on rural life and agriculture; on uses of the natural environment; on the blacks as well as on immigrant groups; on politics and basic political institutions; on labor and business enterprise; on language and on a total life style -- here is just the beginning of our questioning. We would think of this in terms of raising questions; it might well be the case that some investigations would reveal that there was no such impact or that other factors might be more significant or that those changes that did occur, if any, were better attributed to some other influence. We might indeed find the whole issue a debate about whether there was any significant influence at all that could be assigned to an event like the Crash and its aftermath.

Such a project (and it is more obviously one I would think of because of my own interests and my own discipline) might seem initially to have little significance for the sciences. But is this true? Aren't there significant questions that can be raised about biological and even genetic consequences, in terms of nutrition, ecological issues, problems associated with public health and medicine, with mental health and psychology? Aren't there consequences of some significance involved, moreover, for the study and practice of science, perhaps, and for the development and utilization of technology? Aren't there questions that can be raised about the relationship between economic events like a depression and the relationship between man and his natural environment? And, further, isn't it possible that simply raising the question about the possible consequences of an event like the Crash for some of these other disciplines valuable in broadening an awareness among practioners of those disciplines?

And the events of 1929 and after were not confined only to the United States; the questions involved are obviously international;the chance for comparative analysis becomes possible as well. There is almost no field that could not be in some way involved, therefore.

Two other facts about this particular theme: first, we know that there is currently a considerable interest in the 1930's among many students -- the films and the fashions perhaps most especially -- and also a considerable sense of dissatisfaction as well with the ways in which the 1930's attempted to solve the problems of the day; second, an examination of the impact of the depression brings students face to face with the immediate world from which their parents emerged, from what remained at least a kind of backdrop in the lives of their parents. To understand this world and to evaluate critically its problems and the responses to these problems becomes therefore especially important. The comparison of two generations -- one facing the world of depression and the current one facing a world with its special brand of disasters -- and how they responded would be in itself valuable. (There were, for example, student movements on college campuses in the 1930's -- significant and vital ones; what happened to them and why?)

This proposal -- tentative and vague as it is -- is offered only as an illustration of the kind of question or theme to which the college might address itself. In the course of any four-year period subjects would come under analysis that touch more fully some of the more central concerns of many kinds of disciplines but that still might be effectively approached from various perspectives. But it should be obvious that even a theme like the one proposed can adapt itself for significant involvement of a great many minds and talents on campus and could well be a focus for concentrated activity of the kind suggested previously -- a more or less total campus involvement making for a total educational experience for those who wish to participate (and, indeed, with such a center vigorously developed it would be hard for any students to miss some of the impact from the Rutgers College Project).

One final footnote: the idea of the Rutgers College Projects brings into sharp relief the whole question of the involvement of the total campus environment in the process of education. A movie series, an art exhibit, a concert -- these are not events unrelated to the educational opportunities and experiences of our students. No one would wish that all such events on campus be strictly structured, but one might hope that relevant academic departments might be given more often a voice in determining part of such programs so that they might in fact be able to play a more significant total role. It is important to make very effort to relate such activities with the academic program of the college when it is possible and meaningful. The idea of the Rutgers College Project provides one such mechanism. But surely the Departments of Music, English, Art History, for example, ought to play an even greater role than they do in helping to provide, in part, for an "extra-curricular" program of events in the college that makes curricular sense.

RECOMMENDATION:
THE BLACK STUDENT

This report has not, up to this point, done more than allude to special needs and interests of the black students on campus. This was deliberate; it is obvious that the fundamental aim of this report is to suggest ways to liberate the overall system so that the individual needs and interests of all students can be better satisfied without any sacrifice of standards or lack of dedication to the principles of academic discipline and scholarship. This would include all students, black and white.

The record of the college in this area shows a series of significant beginnings. Many years ago under the brilliant leadership of the late Paul Tillet, a large all-university committee was formed, dedicated to investigating the problem of the black student in the state and on the campus. Out of this activity came many achievements, including a program conducted by many dedicated people at Douglass and at Rutgers for discovering and helping young men and women from culturally deprived backgrounds to attend their state university and to be able to achieve here. The admissions officers of the universities in all branches have worked diligently toward this end. At least a decade ago the work offered in the program in American Civilization on this campus *almost always contained* themes or problems related to the whole series of questions about black man in white America and the nature of black culture itself. For at least five years the Department of History has offered American Negro History among its courses. There have always been courses in Political Science and Sociology that also concentrated attention on relevant problems; currently the Political Science Department has added still another special course. Furthermore, we have had every assurance that Livingston College has been making determined efforts to undertake substantial and serious work in African Studies and these efforts are being effectively and enthusiastically supported by the responsible members of our own faculty. The whole idea behind the Federated College Plan will, of course, mean that such work when available will be open to students at Rutgers College as well.

The decision made to allow black students to live together, if they choose, in dormitory sections is in line with the principle of student organization of their dormitory experience proposed in this report. It is unfortunate that this decision and that permitting the blacks to maintain their own fraternities provided no principle of exclusion of non-blacks is involved were made without full discussion and debate in the faculty of the college, which ought to have the significant voice in deciding on any such policy as vital as that to the academic environment of the campus. But these decisions were, I believe, proper ones.

Obviously, all these steps are in the right direction: fuller knowledge and awareness of any problem or area is valuable; self-organization of all students is an important part of the educational process. But no suggestions made thus far come close to dealing with the urgent problems of education for many black students in white urban America. I was much impressed and deeply influenced by the exceptional magazine venture called the Rutgers Afro-American Journal published on this campus last Spring. It helped convince me, along with other reading I had been doing, that we need a more radical solution to these problems than has thus far been proposed. As some of you may know, during the extensive conversations and private musings that followed in the wake of the death of Martin Luther King, I offered a proposal to some colleagues and members of the university administration. I provide a bare outline of the idea here again, if only to stimulate discussion.

If it is true that the educational system at most Northern liberal arts colleges is oriented toward the special needs of the white middle class, and if it has little [illegible] to the life of the black student from the ghetto who hopes most especially to work for the improvement of his own people, it is obvious that we need something far more dramatic than a few courses in black history or black music. It is obvious, too, that the idea of trying to deal with this enormous problem and pretend you can furnish at the same time an education designed primarily for a radically different student with radically different backgrounds and needs is to refuse to face up to the real question and resort instead to a pious fraud. We need a whole new experimental program, perhaps a whole new black college designed not as a segregated institution but as one of our system of growing federated colleges to which any student, white or black, can be admitted, with the same option open to students in that college to take work in any of the other colleges of the university in New Brunswick. We have, after all, a college for women, not to defend the system of the segregation of the sexes but rather because there was (and I take it is) a belief that somehow there are special needs and interests that women have as women that are better handled in a separate woman's college. These same arguments might be made to hold more tellingly for black students. The idea is at least worth testing in the context of a Northern, urban, Federated College Plan. And just as all women will not have to attend Douglass (with the opening of Livingston College) similarly not all black students would have to attend the new experimental college proposed here.

The design of the program of such an experimental college would have to come from those in and of the black urban world, from those who know about and understand the special needs of those countless able young Americans from culturally deprived backgrounds (or better, who represent a cultural background different from our own): people expert in knowledge and experience, black students, the black community and its leaders, the scholars, white and black, and the educators who might be in a position to devise such a college. It might have a drastically altered admissions policy, perhaps even taking talented youngsters who haven't finished high school. It must, in any case, think all questions anew from a fresh base and premise; it must not try simply to graft a program on to a more traditional college one. There are over 700,000 blacks in the state of New Jersey and in spite of extensive and intelligent efforts by Rutgers over the past several years that constituency has not found a significant representation within the state university. Something needs to be done.

I offer this proposal with some hesitation as a spur to discussion. The point is a clear one: if there is anything that is going to be done to create what can be regarded by black students as an education "relevant" to them and the society from which they came, it will have to be something well beyond the traditional kind of courses and the adjustments of living arrangements they have been demanding.

RECOMMENDATION:
HONORS

This report will make no recommendation in this area. Investigation revealed that the current situation was largely satisfactory in most departments and in the college generally in this area. Further, I am now convinced that any work to strengthen Honors Programs in the college must await the more immediately important tasks of general reconstruction.

There is serious dissatisfaction with the Henry Rutgers program and I would recommend that the committee in charge make a full investigation for subsequent report and action to the faculty. An impressionist sampling of recent graduates (since 1962) indicated that most of my correspondents believed that the experience was a significant waste of time but I would not claim that my sample was at all representative. In strong departments with effective upperclass programs for majors the Henry Rutgers program seemed more valued for its prestige (the belief that it helped you get into graduate school) than for its intrinsic value. However, in view of my own position recommending variety and maintaining the need to serve different interests, I certainly would not recommend abolition of the program. Rather, I urge investigation primarily to (1) see what sentiment really is about the program; (2) find what ideas exist to improve it; one of the most frequently suggested was some kind of initial seminar experience for all students involved; and (3) discuss the question of time: if the new course load proposal is adopted, should the Henry Rutgers Project still be a double course? Should it be taken over two semesters or limited to intensive work in one semester (a frequently offered proposal)?

RECOMMENDATION:
SUMMER SESSION

This report has no recommendation to make in this area except to propose a more serious effort to investigate it. We need a thorough study of the Summer Session and its operation, especially in relation to the needs of the college. I simply found myself unable to undertake this task with any pretense at thoroughness. A previous suggestion about the use of the Summer Session as a base to test new course design opens up other possibilities as well. Many students report they especially benefit from language instruction during the summer because the program is intensified (more work in shorter time period). There might be a key to something of value here.

Most departments play the rather silly game of pretending, however, that they can offer the same courses they do during the regular year in reduced time, keeping an accounting of the number of hours spent in the classroom as the significant guide to the equality of course offerings. This is obviously absurd -- part of the gross American educational game of counting and certifying. Courses during the summer ought to be special and different; the rare opportunity that such a summer session might provide to undertake different and more unusual intellectual ventures that more readily can be handled in the time available is seldom seen as a challenge (except in some of the remarkable N.D.E.A. institutes that have been held). Why cannot the institute pattern be broadened to include more and more summer session work; that is, why can't we organize and give similar kinds of courses for students who wish to take them, not necessarily restricting them to teachers?

We need a more thorough-going and imaginitive approach to Summer Session and we must stop pretending it is just another regular session speeded up. But such a full-scale investigation and set of proposals will have to await another investigation.

CONCLUSION

Somewhere behind all that I have written lies a belief: "Man is greater than the purposes to which he can be put." Behind it, too, if sometimes forgotten in the heat of someone's zeal to remake the educational world in the light of one particular doctrine or another, are the simple truths about this conversation we call education. As one English philosopher* would have it:

> As civilized human beings, we are the inheriters, neither of an inquiry about ourselves and the world, nor of an accumulating body of information, but of a conversation begun in the primeval forest and extended and made more articulate in the course of centuries. It is a conversation which goes on both in public and within each of ourselves. Of course there is argument and inquiry and information, but wherever these are profitable they are recognized as passages in this conversation... Conversation is not an interprise designed to yield an extrinsic profit, a contest where the winner gets a prize, nor is it an activity of exegesis; it is an unrehearsed intellectual adventure...Education, properly speaking, is an initiation into the skill and partnership of this conversation in which we learn to recognize the voices, to distinguish the proper occasions of utterance, and in which we all acquire the intellectual and moral habits appropriate to conversation. And it is this conversation which, in the end, gives place and character to every human activity and utterance.

I have come to the end but there is no ending; if this report has any significance it is not as a blueprint for a new heaven or even a new earth but as part of the process of thinking and rethinking, part of the process of building and rebuilding that should come to characterize education at Rutgers College. It is a contribution to the conversation.

I have sought to provide a sense of what that process might be for the college and for its students; I have proposed modifications in structure, program, and policy to help us identify ourselves, to find our special style of educational life; I have tried to open the way to an open college, free of restraints and rigidity, open to experience and experiment without forgetting the needs for sound training and rigorous scholarship; I have tried to suggest the conditions wherein thinking about education itself might become a whole new key to being educated, where liberal education comes to mean a significant awareness of a variety of phenomena and experiences and further, an effective methodology enabling students to make their awareness meaningful; I have argued for an education stressing the interrelatedness of things without insisting on any particular pattern of interrelatedness, for a plurality of visions without the necessary acceptance of any particular set of values, for a program that stresses individual fulfillment which at the same time enables our graduates to make decisions relevant and meaningful for society.

---

*Michael Oakeshott, Rationalism in Politics and Other Essays (London: Methuen, 1962) pp. 198-199.

The magic word *is* relevance; but fortunately there is no single relevance, *no* one and only way in which things can relate. The faculty must show the students a variety of relevancies; the students must learn to use the faculty and their learning for their own purposes, must discover their own relevancies and not assume somehow that their teachers can or will give them "instant relevance." We must, in the best sense, actively use one another in the total process that is our mutual education but we must never forget that man *is* greater than the purposes to which he can be put.

In a sense, this report is unnecessary; Miss Marianne Moore said it all some time ago in her poem "The Student" and all I ask of those who read this report is that they take away from it at least the beauty and the truth found there:

"In America," began
the lecturer, "everyone must have a
degree. The French do not think that
all can have it, they don't say everyone
must go to college." We
incline to feel
that although it may be unnecessary

to know fifteen languages,
one degree is not too much. With us, a
school--like the singing tree of which
the leaves were mouths singing in concert--
is both a tree of knowledge
and of liberty--
seen in the unanimity of college

mottoes, *Lux et veritas,*
Christo et ecclesiae, Sapient
felici. It may be that we
have not knowledge, just opinions, that we
are undergraduates,
not students; we know
we have been told with smiles, by expatriates

of whom we had asked "When will
your experiment be finished?" "Science
is never finished." Secluded
from domestic strife, Jack Bookworm led a
  college life, says Goldsmith;
and here also as
  in France or Oxford study is beset with

dangers,--with bookworms, mildews,
and complaisancies. But someone in New
England has known enough to say
the student is patience personified,
  is a variety
of hero, "patient
  of neglect and of reproach"--who can "hold by

himself." You can't beat hens to
make them lay. Wolf's wool is the best of wool,
but it cannot be sheared because
the wolf will not comply. With knowledge as
  with the wolf's surliness,
the student studies
  voluntarily, refusing to be less

than individual. He
"gives his opinion and then rests on it";
he renders service when there is
no reward, and is too reclusive for
  some things to seem to touch
him, not because he
  has no feeling but because he has so much.

There is nothing more I can add. Miss Moore's student is -- and rightfully -- no longer very patient and no one has ever seen fit to add patience to my vast list of virtues. But even if everything I proposed were to come into being immediately, the process would not end for Rutgers College, for the end is never in sight. Perhaps we should all be satisfied -- all of us who are and will be Rutgers College -- if we can say with a contemporary bard and seer

> I'm doing the best that I can.
> And I've got to admit it's getting better
> A little better all the time.